

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 278 755

UD 025 333

TITLE Safety Net Programs: Are They Reaching Poor Children? A Report of the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families. U.S. House of Representatives, Ninety-Ninth Congress, Second Session, Together with Dissenting Minority Views (September 1986).

INSTITUTION Congress of the U.S., Washington, DC. House Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families.

PUB DATE Sep 86

NOTE 347p.

AVAILABLE FROM Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402.

PUB TYPE Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090) -- Statistical Data (110)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC14 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Adolescents; *Children; Federal Programs; Health; *Hunger; *Low Income Counties; Minority Groups; Nutrition; *Poverty; Public Support; *Welfare Services

IDENTIFIERS Aid to Families with Dependent Children; Congress 99th; Project Head Start; Special Supplemental Food Program Women Infants Child

ABSTRACT

This report focuses on programs for low-income children, covering health, nutrition, education and income maintenance. The number of children below the poverty line in each United States county, using 1980 Census data, was compared with the number of impoverished children reached in 1984 by three critical programs: Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), Head Start, and the Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC). Findings include the following: (1) three million more children have become impoverished since 1979; (2) programs are not available to most impoverished children; (3) existing programs are reaching a lower percentage of impoverished children than before the increase in poverty; (4) counties with the highest child poverty are not getting important children's programs; (5) there are wide disparities among states serving impoverished children; and (6) impoverished children are losing income supports. Included are statistics demonstrating the findings and dissenting minority views. (PS)

*****1:***
 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

[COMMITTEE PRINT]

99TH CONGRESS
2d Session

} HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SAFETY NET PROGRAMS:
ARE THEY REACHING POOR CHILDREN?

A REPORT

OF THE

SELECT COMMITTEE ON CHILDREN,
YOUTH, AND FAMILIES
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETY-NINTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

together with

DISSENTING MINORITY VIEWS



SEPTEMBER 1986

Printed for the use of the
Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

64-602 O

WASHINGTON : 1986

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, DC 20402

64-602 O - 86 - 1

SELECT COMMITTEE ON CHILDREN, YOUTH, AND FAMILIES

GEORGE MILLER, California, *Chairman*

| | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| WILLIAM LEHMAN, Florida | DAN COATS, Indiana |
| PATRICIA SCHROEDER, Colorado | HAMILTON FISH, Jr., New York |
| LINDY (MRS. HALE) BOGGS, Louisiana | THOMAS J. BLILEY, Jr., Virginia |
| MATTHEW F. McHUGH, New York | FRANK R. WOLF, Virginia |
| TED WEISS, New York | NANCY L. JOHNSON, Connecticut |
| BERYL ANTHONY, Jr., Arkansas | JOHN R. McKERNAN, Jr., Maine |
| BARBARA BOXER, California | BARBARA F. VUCANOVICH, Nevada |
| SANDER M. LEVIN, Michigan | DAVID S. MONSON, Utah |
| BRUCE A. MORRISON, Connecticut | ROBERT C. SMITH, New Hampshire |
| J. ROY HOWLAND, Georgia | WILLIAM W. COBEY, Jr., North Carolina |
| GERRY SIKORSKI, Minnesota | |
| ALAN WHEAT, Missouri | |
| MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, California | |
| LANE EVANS, Illinois | |

COMMITTEE STAFF

ALAN J. STONE, *Staff Director and Counsel*
ANN ROSEWATER, *Deputy Staff Director*
MARK SOUDER, *Minority Staff Director*

(II)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| FINDINGS | 2 |
| <u>Chapter I: Children in Poverty</u> | 3 |
| Table I-1: Poverty Status of Related Children Under 18 by Race and Spanish Origin: 1979 and 1984 | 6 |
| Table I-2: Poverty Status of Related Children Under Six by Race and Spanish Origin: 1979 and 1984 | 6 |
| Table I-3: Shifts in Child Poverty: 1979-1984 | 8 |
| Table I-4: Summary by State: Child Poverty Counties | 11 |
| <u>Chapter II: Children's Participation Across Programs: Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), Head Start, and the Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants and Children (WIC).</u> | 13 |
| <u>Chapter III: Children's Participation in AFDC: 1979-1984</u> | 25 |
| Table III-1: AFDC Participation Rates for Low-Income Children by Region: 1979 and 1984 | 27 |
| Table III-2: Children Receiving AFDC Benefits by State and Region: 1979 and 1984 | 28 |
| Table III-3: Summary by State: 1984 AFDC High Participation Counties | 33 |
| Table III-4: Summary by State: 1984 AFDC Low Participation Counties | 34 |
| Table III-5: 1984 AFDC Participation Scores and Rank by State | 35 |
| Table III-6: 1979 AFDC Participation Scores and Rank by State | 37 |
| Table III-7: Summary by State: 1979 AFDC High Participation Counties | 40 |
| Table III-8: Summary by State: 1979 AFDC Low Participation Counties | 41 |
| Table III-9: Maximum AFDC Benefit for A Four-Person Family by State: 1979, 1984, and 1985..... | 44 |
| Table III-10: Number and Percentage of Low-Income Children Receiving AFDC Benefits and Payment Standard for One Needy Adult and Three Children by State: 1979 | 49 |
| Table III-11: AFDC Need Standard and Payment Standard for A One-Parent Family of Four Persons: 1979, 1984, and 1985 | 51 |

(IV)

| | |
|--|----|
| <u>Chapter IV: Children's Participation in Head Start: 1984</u> | 55 |
| Table IV-1: Summary by State: Children Participating in Head Start | 57 |
| Table IV-2: Summary by State: 1984 Head Start High Participation Counties | 59 |
| Table IV-3: Summary by State: 1984 Head Start Low Participation Counties | 60 |
| Table IV-4: 1984 Head Start Participation Scores and Rank by State | 61 |
| <u>Chapter V: Children's Participation in WIC: 1984</u> | 65 |
| Table V-1: Summary by State: Children Participating in WIC .. | 67 |
| Table V-2: Summary by State: 1984 WIC High Participation Counties | 69 |
| Table V-3: Summary by State: 1984 WIC Low Participation Counties | 70 |
| Table V-4: 1984 WIC Participation Scores and Rank by State ... | 72 |

APPENDICES

| | |
|--|-----|
| Appendix A: How the Data Were Obtained | 77 |
| Appendix B: Methods of Analysis | 87 |
| Appendix C: How the Programs Operate | 93 |
| Appendix D: Child Poverty Counties | 107 |
| Appendix E: Tables Relating to Participation Across All Programs.. | 113 |
| Appendix F: Tables Relating to Participation in AFDC | 139 |
| Appendix G: Tables Relating to Participation in Head Start | 269 |
| Appendix H: Tables Relating to Participation in WIC | 287 |
| Appendix I: Counties Served by the Commodity Supplemental Food Program (CSFP) | 301 |
| Appendix J: Sample Letters Requesting AFDC and WIC Data | 305 |
| Appendix K: Expenditures for Selected Programs in Current and Constant (1985) Dollars | 309 |

DISSENTING MINORITY VIEWS

| | |
|---|-----|
| Dissenting Minority Views by Hon. Dan Coats, Ranking Minority Member; Hon. Thomas Bliley, Jr.; Hon. Frank Wolf; Hon. Barbara Vucanovich; Hon. David Monson; Hon. Robert Smith; Hon. Bill Cobey | 312 |
|---|-----|

ADDITIONAL DISSENTING MINORITY VIEWS

| | |
|--|-----|
| Additional Dissenting Minority Views by Hon. Nancy L. Johnson, Hon. Hamilton Fish, Jr., Hon. John R. McKernan, Jr. | 351 |
|--|-----|

INTRODUCTION

The addition of nearly 3 million children to the poverty rolls since 1979 has been a matter of deepest concern to this Committee. Now, 12.5 million children in America -- one-in-five -- are impoverished.

This report is about the condition of the "safety net" designed to protect these children.

Our principal finding is that the record growth in poverty among children has not been accompanied by increased availability of key safety net programs. To the contrary, support programs are not reaching the majority of those in need, are not most available where child poverty is greatest, and in two of the three programs studied, are reaching a lower percentage of impoverished children than before the increase in poverty.

We compared the number of children below the poverty line in each U.S. county (using 1980 Census data, the most recent available) with the number of impoverished children reached in 1984 by three critical programs. We used county-level data because it provides the sharpest possible snapshot of children's economic circumstances and program participation. We did not "weight" counties for population density. Rather, we treat each county equally, and each impoverished child in each county as deserving of the supports provided by these programs.

The programs studied are: Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), the only federal-state entitlement program of income supports to low-income families (66% of AFDC recipients are children); Head Start, a grant program which provides intensive pre-school education services and which has been very successful; and, WIC (the Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants and Children), a grant program which provides high protein foods and access to health care, saving both lives and dollars.^{1/}

In this report we have been conservative in our methods, using only those programs where up-to-date participation figures for children at the county level were available. Major federal programs serving impoverished children, including Food Stamps, Medicaid, and Chapter I of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act, are not included in this study for that reason. When it became necessary to use 1980 Decennial Census poverty data as a proxy for 1984 poverty data, we designed our analysis to minimize the likelihood of any distortions.

Without such an analysis, however, there is no way to determine whether impoverished children are getting the necessary supports provided in AFDC, Head Start, and WIC, and, as the level of need increases, where gaps in services are greatest. That county-level child poverty data are available only every ten years is a source of great frustration to us. We are unwilling to wait until the 1990 Census to take the measure of low-income children's wellbeing which is made possible through this analysis.

Experts differ on which factors have played the most significant role in the recent increase in child poverty. Inadequate family

^{1/} See especially, "Opportunities for Success: Cost-Effective Programs for Children," Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families, U.S. House of Representatives, August 1985.

VI

income, the obvious cause of child poverty, can result from job loss, unemployment, underemployment, and changes in family composition. In order to better understand the recent increase in child poverty, we have asked the Congressional Budget Office to prepare a detailed analysis of the dynamics of the low-income population and larger economic and demographic patterns.

Whatever the causes, however, children are impoverished through no fault of their own, and should have adequate and equal access to basic supports and services, regardless of where they live.

Some have suggested that the private, nonprofit sector can fill the gaps in services to children. Nothing could be further from the truth. Every nonprofit representative appearing before us has testified, and studies conducted by the Urban Institute's Nonprofit Sector Project have verified, that they will never be able to fill the gaps, that they too have lost billions in resources for children and families as a result of federal budget cuts.^{1/} This is true in spite of greatly increased efforts on behalf of volunteers and contributors.

We are heartened that in 1985 and 1986 -- this study began in 1985 using the most recent 1984 data -- both Head Start and WIC have been extended to more counties. Even with these increases, however, the vast majority of low-income children continue to go unserved by these two vital programs.

It is this reality which we must honestly confront as the debate over welfare reform, family policy, and deficit reduction sharpens in the coming months.

There are no doubt ways to improve each of these programs, but we would be foolish to waste our time building new bureaucracies or launching yet more "pilot" programs when we have proven programs that have been reduced during a time of need.

If we were only to use the tools available, millions more children would have a chance to be healthier, more academically successful, and more economically secure. If that is not one principal goal of welfare reform, it is difficult to imagine what is.

The opportunity to excel should be every American child's birthright, not an accident of where they live, or the policies of the moment. As this study shows, this laudable goal is falling ever farther from our grasp.

^{1/} See especially, Abramson, Alan J. and Salamon, Lester M., "The Nonprofit Sector and the New Federal Budget," The Urban Institute Press, Washington, D.C., 1986.

Signed: George Miller, Chairman
William Lehman
Patricia Schroeder
Lindy (Mrs. Hale) Boggs
Matthew F. McHugh
Ted Weiss
Beryl Anthony, Jr.
Barbara Boxer

Sander M. Levin
Bruce A. Morrison
J. Roy Rowland
Gerry Sikorski
Alan Wheat
Matthew G. Martinez
Lane Evans

FINDINGS

Millions More Impoverished Children

- * In 1984, nearly 13 million American children were impoverished, an increase of 3 million (29 percent) since 1979.^{1/} Children under six fell into poverty at the fastest rate. Black children and children of Spanish origin continued to have the highest rates of poverty, however, 2 million of the "newly poor" were white children.^{2/} The Midwest recorded the highest number of "newly poor" children, and the highest rate of increase in child poverty during this period.

Programs Remain Unavailable to Most Impoverished Children

- * In 1984, only one-in-seven poor children participated in Head Start, one-in-three participated in the Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants and Children (WIC), and one-in-two participated in Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC).

Percentage of Impoverished Children Served Drops in 2 of 3 Programs

- * While the number of impoverished children rose dramatically between 1979 and 1984, the percentage of poor children served nationwide by AFDC fell by 22 percent and the percentage enrolled in Head Start declined by 25 percent. The percentage receiving WIC services grew by 22 percent.

Counties with Highest Child Poverty Not Getting Important Children's Programs

In those counties with the highest rates of child poverty,^{3/} the study examined impoverished children's participation in three critical federal support programs -- AFDC, Head Start and WIC:

- * In 1984, fewer than 1 percent of these counties also had high participation among impoverished children in AFDC, Head Start, and WIC.^{4/} No more than 8 percent of these counties had high participation among low-income children in two of the programs.
- * In 1984, over 150 of these counties had no Head Start program and 40 of these counties had no WIC program.

Wide Disparities Among States In Serving Impoverished Children

- * Using the best scale to date for determining current state-wide participation,^{5/} it is clear that wide disparities still exist in the success various states have in providing AFDC, Head Start, and WIC to children at or below the poverty level. The top ten states score over 3-1/2 times higher on this scale with regard to AFDC participation than the ten worst states. With regard to Head Start and WIC participation, the top ten states score 2-1/2 times higher on this scale than the lowest ten states.

VIII

Impoverished Children Losing Income Supports

- * Between 1979 and 1984, the number of children receiving AFDC benefits declined in 30 states.
- * Between 1979 and 1984, 175,000 fewer poverty-level children received AFDC benefits in counties with the highest rates of child poverty, a 10 percent decline.
- * For those impoverished children receiving AFDC benefits, the inflation-adjusted value of AFDC payments declined in 49 states, with the average maximum benefit falling 17 percent.

1/ In 1984, the official poverty line for a four-person family was \$10,609. Children living in families at or below this level, adjusted for family size, are officially considered poor.

2/ In 1985, there were no statistically significant changes in the number of black or white children, or children of Spanish origin in poverty, or in the poverty rates for these groups. This was true for all children under 18 and children under six.

3/ High child poverty counties were defined as the 20 percent of all U.S. counties estimated in the 1980 Decennial Census to have the highest child poverty rates. In each county, 25 percent or more of all children lived in families with incomes at or below the official poverty level.

4/ Counties with high participation were those in the top 20 percent when the number of poor children receiving program services in a county was compared to the number of poor children in the county as estimated in the 1980 Decennial Census. Low participation counties were those in the bottom 20 percent.

5/ All states were rated on their overall level of program participation by children at or below the poverty level. Ratings were based on the percentage of counties in each state that had high levels of program participation minus the percentage of counties with low program participation.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

- Between 1979 and 1984, nearly 3 million more children fell into poverty, an increase of almost 30 percent from 10 million to 12.9 million. The overall child poverty rate increased from 16 to 21 percent, a 31 percent rise (p. 2).
- Minority children remained disproportionately poor. However, more than 2 million of the children who fell into poverty during this period were white children (p. 4).
- The greatest increase in both the number of poor children and the poverty rate for children between 1979 and 1984 occurred in the Midwest. Poverty among midwestern children increased by over 1 million, or by 60 percent, and the poverty rate went from 11 percent to 16 percent, a 41 percent rise (p. 5).
- In 1979 and 1984, poverty rates for children under six for all racial/ethnic groups were consistently higher than for all children under 18. The rate of increase in the number of young, low-income children between 1979 and 1984 was faster than for all children. Over 1.5 million children under six became impoverished, a 45 percent increase. The poverty rate for these children rose from 17.8 percent to 23.4 percent, a 31 percent increase (pp. 5, 7).
- New trends emerged with respect to those groups of children with the highest poverty rates. For example, the group of children under 18 with the highest poverty rate shifted from black children in the South (44 percent in 1979 and 1984) to children of Spanish origin in the Northeast (43 percent in 1979 to 55 percent in 1984) (p. 7).
- Black children under six in the Midwest had the highest poverty rate of any group of children (under six and under 18) in 1984. Nearly two-thirds of these children (63.4 percent) began their lives in poverty (p. 9).

CHAPTER I. CHILDREN IN POVERTY

NATIONAL AND REGIONAL TRENDS IN POVERTY: 1979 - 1984

This section analyzes national and regional trends in the number of impoverished children and in children's poverty rates between 1979 and 1984. Data are presented for all children under 18 years of age, white and black children, and children of Spanish origin, who can be of any race. Shifts in poverty among children under six are also described.

Child Poverty in 1984: Dramatic Increases in Five Years

Between 1979 and 1984, the number of impoverished children increased significantly across the Nation.^{1/}

In 1979, nearly 10 million children (16 percent) in America were poor (Table I-1). By 1984, nearly 3 million more children had fallen into poverty, an increase of almost 30 percent. The poverty rate for all children in 1984, 21 percent, was the highest it has been since 1964, except for the recession years of 1982 (21.3 percent) and 1983 (21.8 percent).

In 1979, poverty rates for black and white children, and children of Spanish origin varied widely. While there were more than 2 million more poor white children than black children in 1979, the poverty rate for black children, 40.8 percent, was over 3-1/2 times the rate for white children, 11.4 percent. The rate for children of Spanish origin, 27.7 percent, was nearly 2-1/2 times the rate for white children.

^{1/} In August, 1986, U.S. Census Bureau released poverty figures for 1985. Numbers of children in poverty and child poverty rates did not change appreciably from 1984 levels.

TABLE I-1
POVERTY STATUS OF RELATED CHILDREN UNDER 18 BY RACE AND SPANISH ORIGIN: 1979 and 1984
(Numbers in thousands)

| UNDER 18 Region, Race & Spanish Origin | 1979 | | | 1984 | | | Absolute Change | | Percent Change | |
|---|--------|-----------------|-----------------|--------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|
| | Total | # Below Poverty | % Below Poverty | Total | # Below Poverty | % Below Poverty | Total | Below Poverty | Total | Below Poverty |
| United States | | | | | | | | | | |
| All races | 62,646 | 9,994 | 16.0 | 61,680 | 12,929 | 21.0 | -966 | 2,935 | -1.5 | 29.4 |
| White | 51,687 | 5,909 | 11.4 | 50,190 | 8,086 | 16.1 | -1,497 | 2,177 | -2.9 | 36.8 |
| Black | 9,172 | 3,746 | 40.8 | 9,355 | 4,320 | 46.2 | 183 | 574 | 2.0 | 15.3 |
| Spanish Origin | 5,426 | 1,504 | 27.7 | 5,983 | 2,317 | 38.7 | 557 | 813* | 10.3 | 54.1 |
| Northeast | | | | | | | | | | |
| All races | 13,064 | 2,013 | 15.4 | 12,121 | 2,486 | 20.5 | -943 | 473 | -7.2 | 23.5 |
| White | 11,119 | 1,369 | 12.3 | 10,186 | 1,675 | 16.4 | -933 | 306 | -8.4 | 22.3 |
| Black | 1,696 | 611 | 36.0 | 1,673 | 764 | 45.7 | -23 | 153 | -1.4 | 25.0 |
| Spanish Origin | 964 | 418 | 43.4 | 1,069 | 588 | 55.0 | 105 | 170* | 10.9 | 40.7 |
| Midwest | | | | | | | | | | |
| All races | 16,503 | 2,088 | 12.6 | 16,055 | 3,291 | 20.5 | -448 | 1,203 | -2.7 | 57.6 |
| White | 14,393 | 1,291 | 9.0 | 13,880 | 2,196 | 15.8 | -513 | 905 | -3.6 | 70.1 |
| Black | 1,876 | 754 | 40.2 | 1,900 | 1,029 | 54.2 | 24 | 275 | 1.3 | 36.5 |
| Spanish Origin | 489 | 100 | 20.4 | 584 | 228 | 39.0 | 95 | 128* | 19.4 | 128.0 |
| South | | | | | | | | | | |
| All races | 21,261 | 4,319 | 20.3 | 20,921 | 4,789 | 22.9 | -340 | 470 | -1.6 | 10.9 |
| White | 16,059 | 2,083 | 13.0 | 15,542 | 2,476 | 15.9 | -517 | 393 | -3.2 | 18.9 |
| Black | 4,898 | 2,160 | 44.3 | 5,027 | 2,233 | 44.4 | 129 | 65 | 2.6 | 3.0 |
| Spanish Origin | 1,642 | 477 | 29.0 | 1,846 | 632 | 34.2 | 204 | 155* | 12.4 | 32.5 |
| West | | | | | | | | | | |
| All races | 11,818 | 1,574 | 13.3 | 12,583 | 2,363 | 18.8 | 765 | 789 | 6.5 | 50.1 |
| White | 10,116 | 1,166 | 11.5 | 10,582 | 1,739 | 16.4 | 466 | 573 | 4.6 | 49.1 |
| Black | 702 | 213 | 30.3 | 755 | 294 | 38.9 | 53 | 81 | 7.5 | 38.0 |
| Spanish Origin | 2,331 | 509 | 21.8 | 2,484 | 869 | 35.0 | 153 | 360* | 6.6 | 70.7 |

* A small part of the increase in the number of poor children of Spanish origin is attributable to changes in estimating procedures instituted by the Census Bureau in 1984.

Source: 1980 and 1985 Current Population Surveys, U.S. Bureau of the Census

The percentages of children in poverty also varied significantly by region in 1979. The lowest child poverty rate was in the Midwest (12.6 percent), the highest in the South (20.3 percent). Black children in the South had the highest rate of poverty of any group of children under 18 in any region, 44.3 percent, followed by children of Spanish origin in the Northeast, 43.4 percent. White children in the Midwest had the lowest poverty rate of any group, 9 percent.

By 1984 the picture had changed considerably.

The vast majority of the "newly poor" children were white children. There were over 2 million more white children living in impoverished families in 1979 than in 1984, a 37 percent increase.

The poverty rate for white children increased from 11.4 percent to 16.1 percent, a 41 percent rise. The pace at which the rate rose for white children was nearly equaled by children of Spanish origin, whose poverty rate rose from 27.7 percent to 38.7 percent, or by 40 percent.

In 1984, black children continued to have the highest rate of poverty among the three racial/ethnic groups. However, over the five-year span, both the number of black children falling into poverty, and the rate of increase in the percentage of children in poverty for this group, was the lowest among the three groups. The poverty rate for black children rose from 40.8 percent in 1979 to 46.2 percent in 1984, or by 13 percent.

Of the 12.9 million children in poverty in 1984, 8.1 million were white, 4.3 million black, and 2.3 million were of Spanish origin.

Finally, during the period between 1979 and 1984, poverty rates for children under six in each region and for each racial/ethnic group were consistently higher than for the entire group of children under 18 (Table I-2).

Rate of Increase Varies by Region; New Patterns Emerge

Every region in the country experienced an increase in child poverty between 1979 and 1984.

By far, however, the greatest increase among poor children occurred in the Midwest. Over 1 million more midwestern children lived in poor families in 1984 than in 1979, an increase of nearly 60 percent.

In the Midwest, there were 275,000 more low-income black children (36.5 percent increase), 900,000 more low-income white children (70 percent increase), and 128,000 more poor children of Spanish origin (128 percent increase), more than doubling the 1979 figure.^{1/}

Child poverty also rose by nearly 800,000 or by over 50 percent in the West. In the West, there were 80,000 more black children in poverty (38 percent increase), 570,000 more white children (49 percent increase) and 360,000 more children of Spanish origin (71 percent increase).

In the Northeast, close to 1/2 million children fell into poverty, nearly a 25 percent increase. Of these children, 150,000 were black children (25 percent increase), 300,000 were white children (22 percent

^{1/} A small part of the increase in the number of poor children of Spanish origin is attributable to changes in estimating procedures instituted by the Census Bureau in 1984.

TABLE I-2
Poverty Status of Related Children Under Six by Race and Spanish Origin: 1979 and 1984
(Numbers in Thousands)

| UNDER 6 Region, Race & Spanish Origin | 1979 | | | 1984 | | | Absolute Change | | Percent Change | |
|--|--------|-----------------|-----------------|--------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|
| | Total | # Below Poverty | % Below Poverty | Total | # Below Poverty | % Below Poverty | Total | Below Poverty | Total | Below Poverty |
| United States | | | | | | | | | | |
| All races | 19,197 | 3,415 | 17.8 | 21,082 | 4,938 | 23.4 | 1,885 | 1,523 | 9.8 | 44.6 |
| White | 15,691 | 2,057 | 13.1 | 17,159 | 3,134 | 18.3 | 1,468 | 1,077 | 9.4 | 52.4 |
| Black | 2,850 | 1,236 | 43.4 | 3,174 | 1,607 | 50.6 | 324 | 371 | 11.4 | 30.0 |
| Spanish Origin | 1,966 | 577 | 29.3 | 2,152 | 869 | 40.4 | 186 | 292* | 9.5 | 50.6 |
| Northeast | | | | | | | | | | |
| All races | 3,616 | 646 | 17.9 | 3,957 | 949 | 24.0 | 341 | 303 | 9.4 | 46.9 |
| White | 3,037 | 446 | 14.7 | 3,305 | 633 | 19.2 | 268 | 187 | 8.8 | 41.9 |
| Black | 486 | 195 | 40.1 | 551 | 300 | 54.4 | 65 | 105 | 13.4 | 53.8 |
| Spanish Origin | 337 | 155 | 46.0 | 372 | 223 | 59.9 | 35 | 68* | 10.4 | 43.9 |
| Midwest | | | | | | | | | | |
| All races | 5,077 | 728 | 14.3 | 5,441 | 1,307 | 24.0 | 364 | 579 | 7.2 | 79.5 |
| White | 4,427 | 477 | 10.8 | 4,474 | 900 | 19.0 | 47 | 423 | 1.1 | 88.7 |
| Black | 557 | 239 | 42.9 | 593 | 376 | 63.4 | 36 | 137 | 6.5 | 57.3 |
| Spanish Origin | 185 | 40 | 21.6 | 203 | 76 | 37.4 | 18 | 36* | 9.7 | 90.0 |
| South | | | | | | | | | | |
| All races | 6,503 | 1,416 | 21.8 | 7,189 | 1,766 | 24.6 | 686 | 350 | 10.5 | 24.7 |
| White | 4,806 | 666 | 13.9 | 5,320 | 930 | 17.5 | 514 | 264 | 10.7 | 39.6 |
| Black | 1,571 | 724 | 46.1 | 1,759 | 807 | 45.9 | 188 | 83 | 12.0 | 11.5 |
| Spanish Origin | 559 | 183 | 32.7 | 674 | 229 | 34.0 | 115 | 46* | 20.6 | 25.1 |
| West | | | | | | | | | | |
| All races | 4,001 | 625 | 15.6 | 4,495 | 916 | 20.4 | 494 | 291 | 12.3 | 46.6 |
| White | 3,421 | 468 | 13.7 | 3,787 | 671 | 17.7 | 366 | 203 | 10.7 | 43.4 |
| Black | 236 | 78 | 33.1 | 271 | 124 | 45.8 | 35 | 46 | 14.8 | 59.0 |
| Spanish Origin | 885 | 199 | 22.5 | 903 | 341 | 37.8 | 18 | 142* | 2.0 | 71.4 |

* A small part of the increase in the number of poor children of Spanish origin is attributable to changes in estimating procedures instituted by the Census Bureau in 1984.

Source: 1980 and 1985 Current Population Surveys, U.S. Bureau of the Census.

-000 16

increase) and 170,000 were children of Spanish origin (41 percent increase).

The rate of increase in poverty was least in the South, 11 percent, although the region continued to have the greatest number and the highest proportion of poor children. In 1984, 4.8 million southern children, 23 percent of all children in the region, lived in families with incomes below the poverty line, up by nearly 1/2 million since 1979. There were 65,000 more black children in poverty (3 percent increase), 390,000 more poor white children (19 percent increase) and 150,000 more poor children of Spanish origin (32.5 percent increase).

While poverty among children increased for all groups in these five years, black children in the South no longer had the highest rate of poverty among children under 18 in 1984 (Table I-3). The poverty rate among children of Spanish origin in the Northeast, 55 percent, was the highest among any group.

The poverty rates for black children in the Midwest and Northeast also grew to exceed those in the South. The poverty rate for black children in the South remained at 44 percent, less than the rate for black children in the Midwest, which increased from 40 percent to 54 percent, and the rate for black children in the Northeast, which climbed from 36 percent to 46 percent.

Poverty Grows Fastest Among Young Children

Over 1.5 million children under six fell into poverty between 1979 and 1984, a 45 percent increase. These "newly poor" young children comprise 30 percent of all impoverished children under six in 1984.

TABLE I-3
Shifts in Child Poverty: 1979-1984

| 1979 | | | 1984 | |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|
| REGION | Rank from Highest to Lowest | Percentage In Poverty | Rank from Highest to Lowest | Percentage In Poverty |
| | 1. South | 20.3 | 1. South | 22.9 |
| | 2. Northeast | 15.4 | 2. Midwest | 20.5 <u>1/</u> |
| | 3. West | 13.3 | 2. Northeast | 20.5 <u>1/</u> |
| | 4. Midwest | 12.6 | 4. West | 18.8 |
| RACE/ETHNIC GROUP | | | | |
| | 1. Black | 40.8 | 1. Black | 46.2 |
| | 2. Spanish Origin | 27.7 | 2. Spanish Origin | 38.7 |
| | 3. White | 11.4 | 3. White | 16.1 |
| REGION & RACE/ETHNIC GROUP | | | | |
| | 1. South/Black | 44.3 | 1. NE/Spanish Origin | 55.0 |
| | 2. NE/Spanish Origin | 43.4 | 2. Midwest/Black | 54.2 |
| | 3. Midwest/Black | 40.2 | 3. NE/Black | 45.7 |
| | 4. NE/Black | 36.0 | 4. South/Black | 44.4 |
| | 5. West/Black | 30.3 | 5. Midwest/Spanish Origin | 39.0 |

1/ Regions with equal percentages of children in poverty received equal rank.

Mirroring trends noted earlier for all children under 18, the great majority of newly poor children under six were white children (71 percent), and the poverty rate for this group increased the fastest, from 13 to 18 percent, a 40 percent rise. The poverty rate for children of Spanish origin under six rose by 38 percent, from 29 to 40 percent, while the rate for blacks rose by 17 percent, from 43 to 51 percent.

However, while poverty among black children rose at a comparatively slower rate than for white children and children of Spanish origin, the 1984 poverty rate for young black children, 51 percent, was the highest national rate recorded for any group of young children since the Census Bureau began keeping these statistics in 1970.

Black children under six in the Midwest emerged as the group with the highest rate of poverty for any group of children in 1984 (under six and under 18). Nearly two-thirds of these children (63.4 percent) began their lives in poverty.

POVERTY AMONG CHILDREN IN AMERICA'S COUNTIES

Taking a County-Level Look at Child Poverty

In this study, special attention is focused on those counties with the highest levels of poverty among children. These counties are designated "Child Poverty Counties" and are used throughout the report to indicate where supports for low-income children are most needed.

The most recent county-level poverty data are from the 1980 Decennial Census. (These data actually reflect the poverty status of children during 1979.) Therefore, Child Poverty Counties always refer to the counties with the highest levels of poverty among children in 1979.

Specifically, Child Poverty Counties are those counties which fall into the highest fifth, or highest quintile in terms of poverty rates as determined by the 1980 Decennial Census. The lower cut-off point for this quintile was 25.2 percent, about 1-1/2 times the national poverty rate (16 percent). Table P-4, Appendix P, identifies 1979 child poverty rates for all U.S. counties, including the 622 Child Poverty Counties. Child Poverty Counties are listed separately in Table D-1, Appendix D, and the data are summarized in Table I-4.^{1/}

^{1/} Child Poverty Counties are defined as those counties that had the highest incidence of children living in families with cash income below official government poverty thresholds. Federal poverty thresholds, however, do not account for variation in the cost-of-living in different localities within the country. Therefore, while in no case could any of the Child Poverty Counties identified here be considered as not in need of substantial support services for low-income children, it could be true that there are other counties in which many families have higher incomes and are not considered officially poor but who do, in fact, have as substantial a need for assistance because of higher costs for goods and services. Unfortunately, the data required to adjust poverty thresholds to reflect varying costs-of-living are not available.

TABLE I-4
Summary by State: Child Poverty Counties

| States | Child Poverty Counties | Total No. Counties | Child Poverty Counties as Percentage of Total Counties |
|----------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|---|
| <u>UNITED STATES</u> | 622 | 3,115 | 20% |
| Alabama | 28 | 67 | 42% |
| Alaska | 0 | 1 ^{1/} | 0% |
| Arizona | 2 | 14 ^{2/} | 14% |
| Arkansas | 30 | 75 | 40% |
| California | 0 | 58 | 0% |
| Colorado | 8 | 63 | 13% |
| Connecticut | 0 | 8 | 0% |
| Delaware | 0 | 3 | 0% |
| District of Col. | 1 | 1 | 100% |
| Florida | 24 | 67 | 36% |
| Georgia | 73 | 159 | 46% |
| Hawaii | 0 | 5 | 0% |
| Idaho | 2 | 44 | 4% |
| Illinois | 3 | 102 | 3% |
| Indiana | 0 | 92 | 0% |
| Iowa | 2 | 99 | 2% |
| Kansas | 0 | 105 | 0% |
| Kentucky | 52 | 120 | 43% |
| Louisiana | 30 | 64 | 47% |
| Maine | 1 | 16 | 6% |
| Maryland | 1 | 24 ^{3/} | 4% |
| Massachusetts | 1 | 14 | 7% |
| Michigan | 1 | 83 | 1% |
| Minnesota | 2 | 87 | 2% |
| Mississippi | 58 | 82 | 70% |

- ^{1/} Alaska has no counties or other state geographical sub-units.
^{2/} One additional county has been created since the Decennial Census was conducted.
^{3/} Includes one independent city.

TABLE I-4 (continued)
Summary by State: Child Poverty Counties

| States | Child Poverty Counties | Total No. Counties | Child Poverty Counties as Percentage of Total Counties |
|----------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|---|
| Missouri | 19 | 115 <u>1/</u> | 16% |
| Montana | 8 | 57 | 14% |
| Nebraska | 10 | 93 | 11% |
| Nevada | 1 | 17 <u>1/</u> | 6% |
| New Hampshire | 0 | 10 | 0% |
| New Jersey | 2 | 21 | 9% |
| New Mexico | 14 | 32 <u>2/</u> | 44% |
| New York | 3 | 62 | 5% |
| North Carolina | 28 | 100 | 26% |
| North Dakota | 13 | 53 | 24% |
| Ohio | 2 | 88 | 2% |
| Oklahoma | 17 | 77 | 22% |
| Oregon | 0 | 36 | 0% |
| Pennsylvania | 1 | 67 | 1% |
| Rhode Island | 0 | 5 | 0% |
| South Carolina | 21 | 46 | 46% |
| South Dakota | 36 | 66 | 54% |
| Tennessee | 22 | 95 | 23% |
| Texas | 78 | 254 | 31% |
| Utah | 1 | 29 | 3% |
| Vermont | 0 | 14 | 0% |
| Virginia | 17 | 136 <u>3/</u> | 13% |
| Washington | 0 | 39 | 0% |
| West Virginia | 10 | 55 | 18% |
| Wisconsin | 0 | 72 | 0% |
| Wyoming | 0 | 23 | 0% |

1/ Includes one independent city.

2/ One additional county has been created since the Decennial Census was conducted.

3/ Includes 41 independent cities.

CHAPTER II: CHILDREN'S PARTICIPATION ACROSS PROGRAMS

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

- Only five Child Poverty Counties (less than one percent) had high levels of participation across all three programs. No more than 50 of the poorest counties (8 percent) had high participation in two programs (p. 17).
- Only 75 of all U.S. counties (less than 3 percent) had high levels of participation among low-income children in AFDC, Head Start and WIC at the same time. At most, 209 counties (7 percent) had contemporaneous high participation in any two of the programs (p. 14).
- Thirty-one of the poorest counties (5 percent) had low levels of support for impoverished children in all three programs. As many as 56 high poverty counties (9 percent) had low participation in two programs (p. 18).
- The number of counties with low participation in two or more programs was consistently higher than the number of counties with high participation in the same programs. For example, 186 counties (6 percent of all counties) had low participation in all three programs, more than twice the number that had high participation in all three programs. The number of counties with low participation in AFDC and Head Start (335, or 11 percent) was three times the number with high participation in those programs (p. 15).
- States varied enormously in program participation. On a scale averaging program participation across AFDC, WIC and Head Start, the ten top States scored twice as high as the lowest ten States (p. 19).

CHAPTER II: CHILDREN'S PARTICIPATION ACROSS PROGRAMS

EXTREMELY FEW COUNTIES HAVE HIGH RATES OF PARTICIPATION ACROSS PROGRAMS, MANY MORE HAVE LOW PARTICIPATION

This section describes the number and geographical distribution of multi-program AFDC, Head Start and WIC High and Low Participation Counties. Counties were designated High Participation Counties in any program if they were among the top fifth (20 percent) of all counties in program participation, measured by comparing the number of children receiving services in the county in March, 1984, or in the case of Head Start, during the 1983-1984 school year, to the most recent estimate of the total number of low-income children in the county. In turn, Low Participation Counties were those counties in the bottom fifth in program participation when the numbers of participants and poor children were compared.^{1/}

75 U.S. Counties Had High Participation in All Programs

Multi-program, High Participation Counties were extremely rare.

Across the Nation, only 75 counties (less than 3 percent of all counties) had high levels of participation in AFDC, Head Start and WIC in 1984 (Table E-1, Appendix E).

The number of counties with high participation rates in two programs was also quite low: 209 Head Start/WIC High Participation Counties (7 percent), 119 AFDC/Head Start High Participation Counties (4 percent), and 207 AFDC/WIC High Participation Counties (7 percent). (Tables E-2 to E-4, Appendix E).

^{1/} The determination of county participation levels utilized 1984 program participation data, however, county-level poverty statistics are drawn from the 1980 Decennial Census, the most recent source for these data. See Appendix B, p. 87, for further discussion.

Majority of High Participation Counties Found in Midwest

By far, the greatest concentration of multi-program High Participation Counties was in the Midwest, especially in Ohio, Wisconsin and Michigan. For example, of the 75 counties that were High Participation Counties in all three programs, 80 percent were in the Midwest, and 53 percent were in the three leading states.

Ohio, Wisconsin and Michigan accounted for 48 percent of all counties that had high participation in AFDC and Head Start, and 45 percent of counties that had high participation in AFDC and WIC.

These three states had a substantial percentage of counties high in Head Start and WIC participation as well. The greatest number of counties with high levels of participation in both of these programs, however, were in the South. Mississippi had the most Head Start/WIC High Participation Counties of any state in the Nation.

Low Participation Counties Outnumber High Participation Counties

One hundred eighty six counties (6 percent of all Counties) had low levels of participation for low-income children in AFDC, Head Start, and WIC (Table E-5, Appendix E).

In 138 of these three-way low participation counties, or 4 percent of all U.S. counties, AFDC benefits went to a small proportion of all poor children, but either WIC benefits or Head Start benefits were completely lacking.

The number of counties that had low participation in two programs was consistently greater than the number with high participation in two programs.

For example, the 335 AFDC/Head Start Low Participation Counties (11 percent of all counties) outnumbered AFDC/Head Start High Participation Counties (119) by nearly three-to-one. There were 325 Head Start/WIC Low Participation Counties (10 percent of all counties), over a third more than the 210 Head Start/WIC High Participation Counties. The 253 AFDC/WIC Low Participation Counties (8 percent of all counties) were 18 percent more than 207 AFDC/WIC High Participation Counties. (Tables E-6 - E-8, Appendix E)

Low Participation Counties Widespread

Multi-program Low Participation Counties were spread throughout the South, West, and Midwest. Only two, however, were located in Northeastern states.

Texas, by far, had the highest number of multi-program Low Participation Counties in each of the possible pairings, both within the South and across all states. Compared to any other state, Texas had more than twice as many counties with low participation in two or more programs.

The 64 Texas counties that had low participation in all programs accounted for nearly one-half of all such counties in the Nation.

Montana also consistently had a high number of multi-program Low Participation Counties. Another western state, Idaho, had a significant number of AFDC/Head Start Low Participation Counties.

In the Midwest, Kansas and Nebraska clearly had the highest numbers of Low Participation Counties across all possible pairings. In addition, North Dakota had numerous AFDC/Head Start Low Participation Counties, while Indiana had a significant number of Head Start/WIC Low Participation Counties.

COUNTIES WITH THE GREATEST CHILD POVERTY DO
NOT HAVE MOST EXTENSIVE SUPPORT PROGRAMS.
LOW PARTICIPATION MORE COMMON

The preceding section analyzed the number and distribution of multi-program High and Low Participation Counties among all U.S. counties. This section isolates those multi-program high or low serving counties that also were counties with high overall levels of child poverty -- Child Poverty Counties.

Strong Support Across Programs Lacking in Poorest Counties

In those counties where poverty among children was most extreme, Child Poverty Counties, high levels of program participation in more than one program was virtually nonexistent.

In the entire Nation, only five Child Poverty Counties, less than 1 percent, had high levels of participation across all three programs (Table E-9, Appendix E).

There were also extremely few Child Poverty Counties that had high levels of participation in two programs. Of the Child Poverty Counties, only 50 (8 percent) had high levels of Head Start and WIC participation; 11 (2 percent) had high levels of Head Start and AFDC participation; and 7 (1 percent) had high levels of AFDC and WIC participation (Tables E-10 - E-12, Appendix E).

Clearly, no state had many Child Poverty Counties that were multi-program High Participation Counties. Mississippi had the highest number of such counties. Fifteen of the state's 58 Poverty Counties had high participation in Head Start and WIC.

Low Participation Across All Programs in Six Percent of Poorest Counties

The number of Child Poverty Counties with low levels of service across all three programs was small, although substantially greater than the number of counties with high participation in those programs. There were 31 Child Poverty Counties (5 percent) in which a high percentage of low-income children received few or none of the supports they need through AFDC, Head Start, and WIC (Table E-13, Appendix E).

Fifty-six Child Poverty Counties (9 percent) were also Low Participation Counties in two programs, AFDC and WIC. There were 54 Child Poverty Counties (9 percent) that had low participation in AFDC and Head Start, and 36 Child Poverty Counties (6 percent) were WIC/Head Start Low Participation Counties. (Tables E-14 - E-16, Appendix E)

Child Poverty Counties with low participation in two or more programs were concentrated in five states: Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota and especially Texas. For example, of the 31 poor counties with low participation in all three programs, nearly half (14) were in Texas, twice as many as in any other state.

ACROSS ALL PROGRAMS, STATES SHOW ENORMOUS RANGE IN
AVERAGE LEVELS OF PARTICIPATION

AFDC, Head Start, and WIC Participation Scales have been developed for each state based on the percentages of High Participation Counties in each state minus the percentage of Low Participation Counties. Each scale provides a relative measure of the degree to which low income children are provided support services in the state. This section compares state's scores on these scales, which can range from -100 to 100.

Wide Gap in Participation Between Top and Bottom States

Participation scores on the APDC, WIC and Head Start Participation Scales were added together and divided by three to determine an average participation score across programs for each state. States were ranked for overall program participation based on these average scores. (Table II-1)

The average scores for the top ten states were added together and divided by ten to determine an "average of average scores" for these ten states. The value, 39, was twice as high as the average of average scores for the bottom ten states, -36.

Michigan consistently ranked third or fourth in participation in the individual programs, yielding the top overall rank. Two other midwestern states, Wisconsin and Ohio were among the top five states in terms of their average score across all programs. Ohio ranked in the top ten in each support program.

Vermont's average score across programs ranked second, primarily reflecting exceptionally strong WIC participation. Similarly, Mississippi ranked fifth, largely due to very strong Head Start enrollment.

Maryland and the District of Columbia ranked sixth and seventh. Maryland's average score reflected consistency in participation across programs while the District's relatively high average was clearly a function of extremely high APDC participation.

Three other states had average participation scores in the top ten overall: Connecticut, Rhode Island and California. The two north-eastern states' scores reflected relatively high APDC and WIC scores

TABLE II-1
APDC, Head Start and WIC Participation Scores
by State and Rank

| State | APDC Score | Head Start Score | WIC Score | Average Score | Rank <u>1/</u> |
|----------------|---------------|------------------------|--------------|------------------|----------------|
| Michigan | 98 | 32 | 43 | 58 | 1 |
| Vermont | 36 | 14 | 100 | 50 | 2 |
| Wisconsin | 89 | 11 | 46 | 49 | 3 |
| Ohio | 90 | 18 | 31 | 46 | 4 |
| Mississippi | -3 | 89 | 29 | 38 | 5 |
| Maryland | 33 | 34 | 38 | 35 | 6 |
| Dist. of Col. | 100 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 7 |
| Connecticut | 63 | 0 | 25 | 29 | 8 |
| Rhode Island | 60 | 0 | 20 | 27 | 9 |
| California | 89 | 0 | -19 | 23 | 10 |
| Illinois | 53 | -9 | 20 | 21 | 11 |
| New Jersey | 81 | 0 | -20 | 20 | 12 |
| South Carolina | 2 | 22 | 37 | 20 | 12 |
| Pennsylvania | 45 | 03 | 4 | 17 | 14 |
| New Hampshire | 10 | 0 | 40 | 17 | 14 |
| Missouri | 3 | 20 | 26 | 16 | 16 |
| Maine | 38 | 13 | -6 | 15 | 17 |
| Minnesota | 16 | 13 | 11 | 13 | 18 |
| Massachusetts | 57 | -7 | -14 | 12 | 19 |
| New York | 28 | -8 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| Iowa | 22 | -5 | 10 | 9 | 21 |
| Wyoming | 5 | -8 | 30 | 9 | 21 |
| Kentucky | 1 | 16 | 9 | 9 | 21 |
| West Virginia | 20 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 24 |
| Hawaii | 100 | 0 | -75 | 8 | 24 |
| Georgia | -7 | -11 | 26 | 3 | 26 |
| Washington | 51 | -16 | -28 | 2 | 27 |
| North Carolina | -23 | -5 | 31 | 1 | 28 |
| Oklahoma | -22 | 29 | -4 | 1 | 28 |
| Delaware | 33 | 0 | -33 | 0 | 30 |

1/ States with equal scores received equal rank.

TABLE II-1 (continued)
APDC, Head Start and WIC Participation Scores
by State and Rank

| State | AFDC Score | Head Start Score | WIC Score | Average Score | Rank <u>1/</u> |
|--------------|---------------|------------------------|--------------|------------------|----------------|
| Alaska | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 |
| Arizona | -7 | 43 | -36 | 0 | 30 |
| Tennessee | -32 | 10 | 12 | -3 | 33 |
| Louisiana | -1 | -23 | 9 | -5 | 34 |
| Alabama | -22 | -13 | 12 | -8 | 35 |
| Nevada | -53 | -12 | 41 | -8 | 36 |
| Florida | -3 | -19 | -10 | -11 | 37 |
| New Mexico | -22 | 22 | -41 | -14 | 38 |
| Virginia | -6 | -54 | 3 | -16 | 39 |
| Indiana | -8 | -31 | -15 | -18 | 40 |
| Colorado | -5 | -35 | -13 | -18 | 40 |
| Arkansas | -49 | 11 | -23 | -20 | 42 |
| Oregon | -3 | -36 | -31 | -23 | 43 |
| Utah | -41 | -41 | -14 | -32 | 44 |
| North Dakota | -62 | -59 | 19 | -34 | 45 |
| South Dakota | -64 | -11 | -28 | -34 | 45 |
| Kansas | -18 | -60 | -47 | -42 | 47 |
| Nebraska | -43 | -49 | -35 | -42 | 47 |
| Idaho | -55 | -39 | -34 | -43 | 49 |
| Texas | -55 | -33 | -51 | -46 | 50 |
| Montana | -44 | -51 | -42 | -46 | 50 |

1/ States with equal scores received equal ranks.

while California reached the top ten almost exclusively because of high AFDC participation.

In contrast to the high scoring states, the two lowest scoring states were Texas and Montana. Montana was in the bottom ten states in AFDC, Head Start and WIC participation, and Texas was among the lowest ten in AFDC and WIC.

Like Montana, the next two lowest ranking states, Idaho and Nebraska were consistently in the bottom ten in each program.

A low average participation score in Kansas largely reflected extremely low participation in Head Start and WIC, while South Dakota's score was due mainly to low AFDC participation. North Dakota's low score reflected very low AFDC and Head Start participation, but relatively high WIC participation.

Two of the other three states in the bottom ten were western states: Utah and Oregon. The final state in the bottom group, Arkansas had above average participation in Head Start but very low AFDC coverage.

Among Regions, Northeast Consistently Highest, West Lowest

Viewing states' AFDC, Head Start, and WIC participation from a regional perspective, it is clear that northeastern states most consistently had high average scores across programs. Led by Vermont, three of nine states in the region were among the top ten states in average participation across programs, and the remaining six were among the top 20.

States in the Midwest showed a distinct split in average participation levels. Three of 11 states in the region were in the top ten and

four others were in the top 20. On the other hand, the remaining five ranked fortieth or lower.

Southern states tended to have lower rates of participation relative to other states. While four of 17 states ranked among the top 20, 13 other states were ranked 30th or lower.

Western states consistently had the lowest average program participation scores. While California ranked tenth, 12 of 13 states in the region were ranked below 30, including five states in the bottom ten.

CHAPTER III: CHILDREN'S PARTICIPATION IN AFDC (1979-1984)

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

- The number of low-income children receiving AFDC benefits in the over 600 counties with the highest child poverty rates in 1979 -- "Child Poverty Counties " -- declined by 175,000 by 1984, a 10 percent drop (p. 38).
- The number of low-income children receiving AFDC benefits between 1979 and 1984 declined in 30 states despite a nationwide increase of three million more poor children (p. 26).
- The percentage of poor children receiving benefits declined by 22 percent between 1979 and 1984, from 71 percent to 55 percent. Regional declines ranged from nearly a 30 percent drop in the Northeast, to a 16 percent decline in the South (p. 26).
- In 1984, only 27 (4 percent) of all Child Poverty Counties had high levels of AFDC participation, a decrease of more than 50 percent since 1979. In 1979, 57 counties (9 percent) of the poorest counties were also AFDC High Participation Counties (p. 39).
- In 1984, 138 (22 percent) of the poorest counties had low AFDC participation among low-income children, five times the number of Child Poverty Counties with high AFDC participation during that year (p. 42).
- States showed a very wide disparity in program participation between the most and least successful states. The average of the top ten states' scores on an AFDC Participation Scale was over 3-1/2 times greater than the average of the lowest ten states' scores (p. 32).
- The value of the average maximum AFDC benefit for a family of four declined by 17 percent between 1979 and 1984, after accounting for inflation. Maximum benefits failed to keep pace with inflation in 49 states, dropping by as much as one-third (p. 46).

- 25 -

64-602 0 - 86 - 2

34

CHAPTER III: CHILDREN'S PARTICIPATION IN AFDC (1979-1984)

CHILD POVERTY INCREASES BY 3 MILLION SINCE 1979, YET OVER HALF
OF ALL STATES SERVE FEWER POOR CHILDREN IN 1984 THAN IN 1979.
PERCENTAGE OF POOR CHILDREN SERVED NATIONALLY AND IN
ALL REGIONS DECLINES DRAMATICALLY

Between 1979 and 1984, the AFDC program failed to respond to rapidly increasing poverty among children, resulting in a dramatic drop in the percentage of low-income children receiving benefits.^{1/}

In the U.S., between 1979 and 1984, the rate of AFDC participation for low-income children dropped from 71 percent to 55 percent, a 22 percent decline (Table III-1).

In every region of the country, rates declined substantially because, while the number of children participating in the program essentially remained stable, the number of poor children climbed rapidly. The number of children receiving AFDC increased by less than 25,000, from 7.066 million in February, 1979, to 7.09 million in March, 1984.

While poverty increased among children by 29 percent between 1979-1984, in more than half the states (30), the number of low-income children served by AFDC declined. (Table F-1, Appendix F, shows the change in the number of children served in each U.S. county between 1979 and 1984. The data are summarized by state and region in Table III-2.)

^{1/} In this context, the term "percentage" refers to the ratio of the number of children receiving AFDC benefits during February, 1979 or March, 1984, to the number of related children living in families with annual incomes below the poverty line in 1979 or 1984. The percentages noted are not, in fact, exact because AFDC eligibility is determined on the basis of monthly income, and children enter and leave the program as their family's income fluctuates. As a result, not all children that receive benefits during one month will live in families whose total annual income will be below the poverty line. See Appendix B, p. 91, for further discussion.

TABLE III-1
AFDC Participation Rates for Low-Income Children
By Region: 1979 and 1984

| | Percentage of Poor Children Receiving AFDC: Feb. 1979 | Percentage of Poor Children Receiving AFDC: Mar. 1984 | Percent Change |
|----------------------|--|--|-------------------|
| <u>UNITED STATES</u> | 71% | 55% | -22% |
| Northeast | 96% | 68% | -29% |
| Midwest | 89% | 64% | -28% |
| South | 45% | 38% | -16% |
| West | 85% | 62% | -27% |

Table III-2
Children Receiving AFDC Benefits by
State and Region: 1979 and 1984

| | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in Feb. 1979 | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in Mar. 1984 | Absolute Change | Percent Change |
|----------------------|--|--|--------------------|-------------------|
| <u>UNITED STATES</u> | 7,065,785 | 7,089,581 | 23,796 | .5% |
| <u>Northeast</u> | 1,937,039 | 1,703,722 | -233,317 | -12% |
| Connecticut | 94,216 | 83,963 | -10,253 | -11% |
| Maine | 40,306 | 32,471 | -7,835 | -19% |
| Massachusetts | 235,834 | 158,289 | -77,545 | -33% |
| New Hampshire | 14,164 | 12,916 | -1,248 | -9% |
| New Jersey | 319,258 | 256,585 | -62,673 | -20% |
| New York | 773,464 | 734,294 | -39,170 | -5% |
| Pennsylvania | 412,120 | 381,567 | -30,553 | -7% |
| Rhode Island | 34,447 | 29,497 | -4,950 | -14% |
| Vermont | 13,230 | 14,140 | 910 | 7% |
| <u>Midwest</u> | 1,862,305 | 2,094,382 | 232,077 | 12% |
| Illinois | 478,867 | 499,246 | 20,379 | 4% |
| Indiana | 105,553 | 111,513 | 5,960 | 6% |
| Iowa | 62,560 | 71,754 | 9,194 | 15% |
| Kansas | 46,521 | 47,362 | 841 | 2% |
| Michigan | 430,765 | 481,303 | 50,538 | 12% |
| Minnesota | 87,780 | 93,727 | 5,947 | 7% |
| Missouri | 132,732 | 130,718 | -2,014 | -1% |
| Nebraska | 25,155 | 29,005 | 3,850 | 15% |
| North Dakota | 9,187 | 7,551 | -1,636 | -18% |
| Ohio | 330,673 | 431,623 | 100,950 | 30% |
| South Dakota | 14,721 | 11,350 | -3,371 | -23% |
| Wisconsin | 137,791 | 179,230 | 41,439 | 30% |

Table III-2 (continued)
Children Receiving AFDC Benefits by
State and Region: 1979 and 1984

| | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in Feb. 1979 | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in Mar. 1984 | Absolute Change | Percent Change |
|----------------|--|--|--------------------|-------------------|
| <u>South</u> | 1,933,398 | 1,830,399 | -102,999 | -5% |
| Alabama | 127,332 | 107,770 | -19,562 | -15% |
| Arkansas | 64,348 | 44,399 | -19,949 | -31% |
| Delaware | 22,702 | 16,811 | -5,891 | -26% |
| Dist. of Col. | 61,645 | 45,536 | -16,109 | -26% |
| Florida | 168,115 | 181,813 | 13,698 | 8% |
| Georgia | 150,764 | 170,928 | 20,164 | 13% |
| Kentucky | 116,292 | 101,513 | -14,779 | -13% |
| Louisiana | 149,777 | 154,018 | 4,241 | 3% |
| Maryland | 142,242 | 124,368 | -17,874 | -13% |
| Mississippi | 128,075 | 109,722 | -18,353 | -14% |
| North Carolina | 139,118 | 113,967 | -25,151 | -18% |
| Oklahoma | 62,423 | 57,637 | -4,786 | -8% |
| South Carolina | 103,198 | 89,406 | -13,792 | -13% |
| Tennessee | 114,608 | 104,677 | -9,931 | -9% |
| Texas | 212,205 | 239,143 | 26,938 | 13% |
| Virginia | 114,429 | 105,513 | -8,916 | -8% |
| West Virginia | 56,125 | 63,178 | 7,053 | 13% |
| <u>West</u> | 1,333,043 | 1,461,078 | 128,035 | 10% |
| Alaska | 9,955 | 9,037 | -918 | -9% |
| Arizona | 34,319 | 51,882 | 17,563 | 51% |
| California | 925,608 | 1,065,254 | 139,646 | 15% |
| Colorado | 55,515 | 52,157 | -3,358 | -6% |
| Hawaii | 39,442 | 34,581 | -4,861 | -12% |
| Idaho | 13,682 | 12,581 | -1,101 | -8% |
| Montana | 12,396 | 13,209 | 813 | 7% |
| Nevada | 6,962 | 8,578 | 1,616 | 23% |
| New Mexico | 36,038 | 31,920 | -4,118 | -11% |
| Oregon | 76,943 | 45,938 | -31,005 | -40% |
| Utah | 26,552 | 24,500 | -2,052 | -8% |
| Washington | 91,256 | 105,455 | 14,199 | 16% |
| Wyoming | 4,375 | 5,986 | 1,611 | 37% |

Northeast, South Hardest Hit

In both the Northeast and South, both the number and the percentage of low-income children participating in AFDC declined between 1979 and 1984.

The steepest drop in AFDC occurred in the Northeast. Participation dropped from 96 percent in 1979 to 68 percent in 1984, or by 29 percent.

During this period, over 200,000 fewer children received benefits in the Northeast, while the number of poor children increased by nearly one-half million, from 2.0 million to 2.5 million or by 23 percent.

The percentage of children receiving benefits in the South also fell from 45 percent in 1979 to 38 percent in 1984, the lowest in the Nation. Twelve southern states served fewer children in 1984 than in 1979.

During that period, the number of children receiving benefits dropped by over 100,000, while poverty among southern children increased by nearly one-half million, from 4.3 million to 4.8 million, or by 11 percent.

Only one state in the Northeast (Vermont) and five southern states (Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Texas and West Virginia) provided benefits to a greater number of children in 1984 than in 1979.

More Served in Midwest, West, But Rates of Participation Decline

The rate of increase in the number of children in poverty in both the Midwest (58 percent) and in the West (50 percent) was twice as great as in the Northeast (23 percent) and nearly five times greater than in the South (11 percent).

- 30 -

In response to the enormous growth in poverty in the Midwest and West, the number of children receiving benefits rose moderately, despite various factors restricting growth in AFDC caseloads.^{1/} But the increase in AFDC participants was not nearly comparable to the increase in poor children, causing therefore a steep decline in poor children's rate of participation in AFDC.

The percentage of low-income children receiving AFDC benefits in the Midwest declined by 28 percent between 1979 and 1984, from 89 percent to 64 percent. This occurred despite the fact that over 200,000 more children in the region received benefits and all but three states served more children in 1984 than in 1979.

Over the same period, poverty increased faster in the Midwest than in any other region. The number of low-income children increased by 1.2 million, from 2.1 million in 1979 to 3.3 million in 1984, or by 58 percent.

Similarly in the West, the percentage of low-income children receiving benefits declined by 27 percent between 1979 and 1984, from 85 percent to 62 percent, despite an increase of over 150,000 in the number of children participating in the program. Over the five-year span, 800,000 more children in the West became impoverished.

WIDE VARIATION IN STATE AFDC PARTICIPATION IN 1984.
PATTERNS CONSISTENT WITH 1979 TRENDS

The previous section analyzed national and regional trends in AFDC participation (1979-1984). This section compares low income children's AFDC participation between states in 1984, and contrasts these findings with similar data from 1979.

^{1/} See p. 47 in this chapter for a discussion of state and federal limits on AFDC eligibility.

For the purposes of comparing states, we have developed an AFDC Participation Scale. For each state, the Participation Scale reflects the percentage of AFDC High Participation Counties minus the percentage of AFDC Low Participation Counties.

High Participation Counties are those counties in the top fifth in terms of AFDC participation when the number of children receiving benefits is compared to the estimated total number of low-income children (Table F-2, Appendix F, summarized in Table III-3). Low Participation Counties are those counties in the lowest fifth in terms of AFDC participation (Table F-3, Appendix F, summarized in Table III-4).^{1/} The range of possible scores on the AFDC Participation Scale for 1979 and 1984 was -100 to 100.

Substantial Split Between Most and Least Successful States

A comparison of AFDC participation scores for the top ten states and those of the lowest ten makes clear the vast disparity between states in the degree that income support was extended to low-income children. The average of the top ten states' scores (83) was over 3-1/2 times greater than the average of the bottom ten states (-50) (Table III-5).

Two states, Hawaii and the District of Columbia ^{2/}, each had the maximum score on the AFDC Participation Scale. These scores were over 5-1/2 times greater than South Dakota's score, the lowest for any state.

-
- ^{1/} The determination of county participation levels utilized 1984 program participation data, however, county-level poverty statistics are drawn from the 1980 Decennial Census, the most recent source for these data. See Appendix B, p. 87, for further discussion.
 - ^{2/} Throughout this report, the District of Columbia is included in both state- and county-level analyses.

TABLE III-3
Summary by State: 1984 AFDC High Participation Counties
(N = 619)

| State and Total No. of Counties ^{1/} | High Participation Counties and Percent of All Counties | State and Total No. of Counties ^{1/} | High Participation Counties and Percent of All Counties |
|---|---|---|---|
| Alabama (67) | 0 (0%) | Missouri (115) | 15 (13%) |
| Alaska (1) | 0 (0%) | Montana (57) | 2 (3%) |
| Arizona (14) | 0 (0%) | Nebraska (93) | 7 (7%) |
| Arkansas (75) | 0 (0%) | Nevada (17) | 1 (6%) |
| California (58) | 53 (91%) | New Hampshire (10) | 1 (10%) |
| Colorado (63) | 11 (17%) | New Jersey (21) | 17 (81%) |
| Connecticut (8) | 5 (63%) | New Mexico (32) | 0 (0%) |
| Delaware (3) | 1 (33%) | New York (58) | 16 (28%) |
| Dist. of Col. (1) | 1 (100%) | North Carolina (100) | 1 (1%) |
| Florida (67) | 0 (0%) | North Dakota (53) | 1 (2%) |
| Georgia (159) | 3 (2%) | Ohio (88) | 80 (91%) |
| Hawaii (4) | 4 (100%) | Oklahoma (77) | 0 (0%) |
| Idaho (44) | 2 (4%) | Oregon (36) | 3 (8%) |
| Illinois (102) | 54 (53%) | Pennsylvania (67) | 31 (46%) |
| Indiana (92) | 5 (5%) | Rhode Island (5) | 3 (60%) |
| Iowa (99) | 29 (29%) | South Carolina (46) | 3 (6%) |
| Kansas (105) | 16 (15%) | South Dakota (66) | 0 (0%) |
| Kentucky (120) | 4 (3%) | Tennessee (95) | 0 (0%) |
| Louisiana (63) | 1 (2%) | Texas (253) | 0 (0%) |
| Maine (16) | 6 (38%) | Utah (29) | 2 (7%) |
| Maryland (24) | 8 (33%) | Vermont (14) | 5 (36%) |
| Massachusetts (14) | 8 (57%) | Virginia (131) | 11 (8%) |
| Michigan (83) | 81 (98%) | Washington (39) | 21 (54%) |
| Minnesota (83) | 24 (29%) | West Virginia (55) | 13 (24%) |
| Mississippi (82) | 1 (1%) | Wisconsin (72) | 64 (89%) |
| | | Wyoming (23) | 5 (22%) |

^{1/} Counties in which no low-income children resided, or where the AFDC program was administered in an adjacent county, (see Appendix A, pp. 78 and 80) have been excluded.

TABLE III-4
Summary by State: 1984 AFDC Low Participation Counties
(N = 620)

| State and Total No. of Counties <u>1/</u> | Low Participation Counties and Percent of All Counties | State and Total No. of Counties <u>1/</u> | Low Participation Counties and Percent of All Counties |
|---|--|---|--|
| Alabama (67) | 15 (22%) | Missouri (115) | 11 (10%) |
| Alaska (1) | 0 (0%) | Montana (57) | 27 (47%) |
| Arizona (14) | 1 (7%) | Nebraska (93) | 47 (50%) |
| Arkansas (75) | 37 (49%) | Nevada (17) | 10 (59%) |
| California (58) | 1 (2%) | New Hampshire (10) | 0 (0%) |
| Colorado (63) | 14 (22%) | New Jersey (21) | 0 (0%) |
| Connecticut (8) | 0 (0%) | New Mexico (32) | 7 (22%) |
| Delaware (3) | 0 (0%) | New York (58) | 0 (0%) |
| Dist. of Col. (1) | 0 (0%) | North Carolina (100) | 24 (24%) |
| Florida (67) | 2 (3%) | North Dakota (53) | 34 (64%) |
| Georgia (159) | 15 (9%) | Ohio (88) | 1 (1%) |
| Hawaii (4) | 0 (0%) | Oklahoma (77) | 17 (22%) |
| Idaho (44) | 26 (59%) | Oregon (36) | 4 (11%) |
| Illinois (102) | 0 (0%) | Pennsylvania (67) | 1 (1%) |
| Indiana (92) | 12 (13%) | Rhode Island (5) | 0 (0%) |
| Iowa (99) | 1 (7%) | South Carolina (46) | 2 (4%) |
| Kansas (105) | 35 (33%) | South Dakota (66) | 42 (64%) |
| Kentucky (120) | 2 (2%) | Tennessee (95) | 30 (32%) |
| Louisiana (63) | 2 (3%) | Texas (253) | 140 (55%) |
| Maine (16) | 0 (0%) | Utah (29) | 14 (48%) |
| Maryland (24) | 0 (0%) | Vermont (14) | 0 (0%) |
| Massachusetts (14) | 0 (0%) | Virginia (131) | 19 (14%) |
| Michigan (83) | 0 (0%) | Washington (39) | 1 (3%) |
| Minnesota (83) | 11 (13%) | West Virginia (55) | 2 (4%) |
| Mississippi (82) | 3 (4%) | Wisconsin (72) | 0 (0%) |
| | | Wyoming (23) | 4 (17%) |

1/ Counties in which no low-income children resided, or where the AFDC program was administered in an adjacent county, (see Appendix A, pp. 78 and 80) have been excluded.

TABLE III-5
1984 APDC Participation Scores and Rank by State

| State | Score | Rank <u>1/</u> | State | Score | Rank <u>1/</u> |
|----------------|-------|----------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Dist. of Col. | 100 | 1 | Kentucky | 1 | 26 |
| Hawaii | 100 | 1 | Alaska | 0 | 27 |
| Michigan | 98 | 3 | Louisiana | -1 | 28 |
| Ohio | 90 | 4 | Mississippi | -3 | 29 |
| Wisconsin | 89 | 5 | Florida | -3 | 29 |
| California | 89 | 5 | Oregon | -3 | 29 |
| New Jersey | 81 | 7 | Colorado | -5 | 32 |
| Connecticut | 63 | 8 | Virginia | -6 | 33 |
| Rhode Island | 60 | 9 | Arizona | -7 | 34 |
| Massachusetts | 57 | 10 | Georgia | -7 | 34 |
| Illinois | 53 | 11 | Indiana | -8 | 36 |
| Washington | 51 | 12 | Kansas | -18 | 37 |
| Pennsylvania | 45 | 13 | Alabama | -22 | 38 |
| Maine | 38 | 14 | New Mexico | -22 | 38 |
| Vermont | 36 | 15 | Oklahoma | -22 | 38 |
| Maryland | 33 | 16 | North Carolina | -23 | 41 |
| Delaware | 33 | 16 | Tennessee | -32 | 42 |
| New York | 28 | 18 | Utah | -41 | 43 |
| Iowa | 22 | 19 | Nebraska | -43 | 44 |
| West Virginia | 20 | 20 | Montana | -44 | 45 |
| Minnesota | 16 | 21 | Arkansas | -49 | 46 |
| New Hampshire | 10 | 22 | Nevada | -53 | 47 |
| Wyoming | 5 | 23 | Idaho | -55 | 48 |
| Missouri | 3 | 24 | Texas | -55 | 48 |
| South Carolina | 2 | 25 | North Dakota | -62 | 50 |
| | | | South Dakota | -64 | 51 |

1/ States with equal scores received equal ranks.

The top scores reflect the fact that the District of Columbia, and all of Hawaii's counties in which low-income children resided, were AFDC High Participation Counties. In the next highest scoring states, Michigan, Ohio, Wisconsin, and California, AFDC High Participation Counties comprised about 90 percent or more of all counties, and no more than one county had low participation.

In contrast, all of the ten lowest scoring states had virtually no High Participation Counties, and Low Participation Counties comprised about one-third or more in each.

The four other states among the top ten in AFDC participation in 1984 were New Jersey, Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Massachusetts. High scores in each of these northeastern states reflected high levels of participation in more than half of all counties, and the complete absence of Low Participation Counties.

In the five lowest scoring states -- South Dakota, North Dakota, Texas, Idaho, and Nevada -- no more than two counties were High Participation Counties and a majority of counties in each state were Low Participation Counties (nearly two-thirds in North and South Dakota).

Of the remaining states in the bottom ten -- Arkansas, Montana, Nebraska, Utah, and Tennessee -- only Nebraska had more than two AFDC High Participation Counties.

AFDC Participation Consistent Between 1979-1984

States' AFDC participation score and rank in 1979 (Table III-6) compared to 1984 shows a significant degree of consistency over time in the level of support provided to low income children. For example, for

TABLE III-6
1979 AFDC Participation Scores and Rank by State

| State | Score | Rank <u>1/</u> | State | Score | Rank <u>1/</u> |
|----------------|-------|----------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Alaska | 100 | 1 | Kentucky | 6 | 26 |
| Connecticut | 100 | 1 | Virginia | 3 | 27 |
| Dist. of Col. | 100 | 1 | Louisiana | 1 | 28 |
| Hawaii | 100 | 1 | Minnesota | 0 | 29 |
| Massachusetts | 100 | 1 | Alabama | -3 | 30 |
| Rhode Island | 100 | 1 | Colorado | -9 | 31 |
| Michigan | 95 | 7 | Florida | -9 | 31 |
| New Jersey | 90 | 8 | Georgia | -9 | 31 |
| California | 86 | 9 | New Mexico | -9 | 31 |
| Maine | 81 | 10 | Missouri | -11 | 35 |
| Wisconsin | 76 | 11 | Kansas | -12 | 36 |
| Oregon | 72 | 12 | North Carolina | -13 | 37 |
| Maryland | 50 | 13 | Oklahoma | -16 | 38 |
| Pennsylvania | 48 | 14 | Arkansas | -21 | 39 |
| Washington | 46 | 15 | Indiana | -21 | 39 |
| Vermont | 36 | 16 | Tennessee | -25 | 41 |
| Ohio | 35 | 17 | Utah | -28 | 42 |
| Delaware | 33 | 18 | Wyoming | -31 | 43 |
| New York | 32 | 19 | Montana | -41 | 44 |
| New Hampshire | 30 | 20 | Arizona | -43 | 45 |
| West Virginia | 23 | 21 | North Dakota | -43 | 45 |
| South Carolina | 20 | 22 | South Dakota | -45 | 47 |
| Iowa | 16 | 23 | Idaho | -50 | 48 |
| Illinois | 8 | 24 | Texas | -55 | 49 |
| Mississippi | 7 | 25 | Nebraska | -58 | 50 |
| | | | Nevada | -59 | 51 |

1/ States with equal scores received equal ranks.

both the ten highest and the ten lowest scoring states in 1984, eight were also in the corresponding group in 1979.

However, scores and ranks for a few states changed significantly between 1979 and 1984, largely reflecting a substantial increase or decline in the number of children receiving benefits. Oregon, which experienced a 40 percent decline in the numbers of children served, dropped from twelfth in AFDC participation in 1979 to twenty-ninth in 1984.

In contrast, the number of low-income children receiving benefits in Wyoming rose by 37 percent from 1979 to 1984, raising the state's rank from forty-third to twenty-third.

MILLIONS DO NOT PARTICIPATE IN AFDC.
PARTICIPATION DECLINES IN POOREST COUNTIES

This section analyzes the percentage of low-income children receiving AFDC benefits in all counties during 1979, and the degree to which low-income children in counties with the greatest level of poverty among children -- Child Poverty Counties -- received AFDC benefits in 1979 and 1984.

Number of Children Served Drops in Poorest Counties

In the 622 Child Poverty Counties (counties in the top fifth in terms of child poverty rates in 1979, all 25 percent or more), 1.728 million low-income children received AFDC benefits in 1979. In 1984, despite a severe increase in poverty across the Nation, the number of children receiving benefits declined by 175,000 to 1.553 million, a 10 percent drop. In 24 of the 37 states that contained Child Poverty Counties, the number of children receiving benefits declined.

In 1979, Less than Half of All Poor Children Served in 2000 Counties

In 1979, less than half of all impoverished children participated in AFDC in 2,086 counties, two-thirds of all U.S. counties. In 1,182 counties, AFDC benefits were provided to only one-third or fewer low income children. (See Table F-4, Appendix F, for 1979 AFDC participation rates for all U.S. counties.)

In 1979, the 620 AFDC High Participation Counties (counties in the top fifth in AFDC participation in 1979) served about two-thirds (63 percent) or more of all low-income children in each of those counties (Table F-5, Appendix F, summarized in Table III-7), while the AFDC Low Participation Counties (counties in the lowest fifth in AFDC participation in 1979) served less than one-fourth (24 percent) of all poor children (Table F-6, Appendix F, summarized in Table III-8).

High Participation Child Poverty Counties Decline by 50 Percent in 1984

Counties with the most children in need of income supports, Child Poverty Counties, are not the counties with the highest percentages of participation among low-income children.

In 1984, only 4 percent of all Child Poverty Counties (27) were also AFDC High Participation Counties (Table F-7, Appendix F).

The meager number of Child Poverty/AFDC High Participation Counties in 1984 represents over a 50 percent decline in the number of such counties since 1979. In 1979, 57 counties with the most poverty among children were AFDC High Participation Counties -- counties providing AFDC income assistance to more than about two-thirds of those needy children (Table F-9, Appendix F).

TABLE II-7
Summary by State: 1979 AFDC High Participation Counties
(N = 619)

| State and Total No. of Counties <u>1/</u> | High Participation Counties and Percent of All Counties | State and Total No. of Counties <u>1/</u> | High Participation Counties and Percent of All Counties |
|---|---|---|---|
| Alabama (67) | 4 (6%) | Missouri (115) | 10 (9%) |
| Alaska (1) | 1 (100%) | Montana (57) | 2 (3%) |
| Arizona (14) | 0 (0%) | Nebraska (93) | 4 (4%) |
| Arkansas (75) | 2 (3%) | Nevada (17) | 1 (6%) |
| California (58) | 50 (86%) | New Hampshire (10) | 3 (30%) |
| Colorado (63) | 10 (16%) | New Jersey (21) | 19 (90%) |
| Connecticut (8) | 8 (100%) | New Mexico (32) | 0 (0%) |
| Delaware (3) | 1 (33%) | New York (58) | 20 (34%) |
| Dist. of Col. (1) | 1 (100%) | North Carolina (100) | 7 (7%) |
| Florida (67) | 0 (0%) | North Dakota (53) | 2 (4%) |
| Georgia (159) | 4 (2%) | Ohio (88) | 32 (36%) |
| Hawaii (4) | 4 (100%) | Oklahoma (77) | 1 (1%) |
| Idaho (44) | 1 (2%) | Oregon (36) | 28 (78%) |
| Illinois (102) | 23 (22%) | Pennsylvania (67) | 32 (48%) |
| Indiana (92) | 8 (9%) | Rhode Island (5) | 5 (100%) |
| Iowa (99) | 25 (25%) | South Carolina (46) | 11 (24%) |
| Kansas (105) | 16 (15%) | South Dakota (66) | 4 (6%) |
| Kentucky (120) | 11 (9%) | Tennessee (95) | 1 (1%) |
| Louisiana (63) | 4 (6%) | Texas (253) | 1 (1%) |
| Maine (16) | 13 (81%) | Utah (29) | 3 (10%) |
| Maryland (24) | 12 (50%) | Vermont (14) | 5 (36%) |
| Massachusetts (14) | 14 (100%) | Virginia (131) | 20 (15%) |
| Michigan (83) | 79 (95%) | Washington (39) | 19 (49%) |
| Minnesota (83) | 20 (24%) | West Virginia (55) | 13 (24%) |
| Mississippi (82) | 9 (11%) | Wisconsin (72) | 55 (76%) |
| | | Wyoming (23) | 1 (4%) |

1/ Counties in which no low-income children resided, or where the AFDC program was administered in an adjacent county, (see Appendix A, pp. 78 and 80) have been excluded.

TABLE III-8
Summary by State: 1979 AFDC Low Participation Counties
(N = 620)

| State and Total No. of Counties ^{1/} | Low Participation Counties and Percent of All Counties | State and Total No. of Counties ^{1/} | Low Participation Counties and Percent of All Counties |
|---|--|---|--|
| Alabama (67) | 6 (9%) | Missouri (115) | 23 (20%) |
| Alaska (1) | 0 (0%) | Montana (57) | 25 (44%) |
| Arizona (14) | 6 (43%) | Nebraska (93) | 58 (62%) |
| Arkansas (75) | 18 (24%) | Nevada (17) | 11 (65%) |
| California (58) | 0 (0%) | New Hampshire (10) | 0 (0%) |
| Colorado (63) | 16 (25%) | New Jersey (21) | 0 (0%) |
| Connecticut (8) | 0 (0%) | New Mexico (32) | 3 (9%) |
| Delaware (3) | 0 (0%) | New York (58) | 1 (2%) |
| Dist. of Col. (1) | 0 (0%) | North Carolina (100) | 20 (20%) |
| Florida (67) | 6 (9%) | North Dakota (53) | 25 (47%) |
| Georgia (159) | 17 (11%) | Ohio (88) | 1 (1%) |
| Hawaii (4) | 0 (0%) | Oklahoma (77) | 13 (17%) |
| Idaho (44) | 23 (52%) | Oregon (36) | 2 (6%) |
| Illinois (102) | 14 (14%) | Pennsylvania (67) | 0 (0%) |
| Indiana (92) | 28 (30%) | Rhode Island (5) | 0 (0%) |
| Iowa (99) | 9 (9%) | South Carolina (46) | 2 (4%) |
| Kansas (105) | 28 (27%) | South Dakota (66) | 34 (51%) |
| Kentucky (120) | 3 (3%) | Tennessee (95) | 25 (26%) |
| Louisiana (63) | 3 (5%) | Texas (253) | 142 (56%) |
| Maine (16) | 0 (0%) | Utah (29) | 11 (38%) |
| Maryland (24) | 0 (0%) | Vermont (14) | 0 (0%) |
| Massachusetts (14) | 0 (0%) | Virginia (131) | 16 (12%) |
| Michigan (83) | 0 (0%) | Washington (39) | 1 (3%) |
| Minnesota (83) | 20 (24%) | West Virginia (55) | 1 (1%) |
| Mississippi (82) | 3 (4%) | Wisconsin (72) | 0 (0%) |
| | | Wyoming (23) | 8 (35%) |

^{1/} Counties in which no low-income children resided, or where the AFDC program was administered in an adjacent county, (see Appendix A, pp. 78 and 80) have been excluded.

Thus, while relatively high levels of income assistance existed in only 9 percent of the over 600 counties with high concentrations of low-income children in 1979, that percentage was twice as great as in 1984.

As would be expected with such a small number of counties in both 1979 and 1984, no clear geographic patterns were apparent. However, it is worth noting that among the few Child Poverty/High Participation Counties in both years were a number of counties that contain major American cities, including Baltimore, MD; Atlanta, GA; New York, NY; Philadelphia, PA; Richmond, VA; St. Louis, MO; Boston, MA; and Washington, DC.

Low Participation Among Poorest Counties in 1984 and 1979

In 1984, 138 or 22 percent of all Child Poverty Counties were also Low Participation Counties (Table F-8, Appendix F), over five times as many as were Child Poverty/APDC High Participation Counties.

The rate of low participation among Child Poverty Counties in 1984 was slightly higher than the 1979 rate. In 1979, 129 or 21 percent of the poorest counties were APDC Low Participation Counties -- counties where no more than about one-fourth of all poor children received benefits (Table F-10, Appendix F).

FAILURE OF APDC TO MEET INCREASED NEED PARALLELED BY DRAMATIC EROSION IN VALUE OF BENEFITS

A true picture of how well low-income children are served by APDC must take into account the value of the benefits as well as the number of children who receive assistance.

Even in 1979, the maximum benefits available through APDC were insufficient in every state to provide a family with enough annual

income to lift them out of poverty. Yet, between 1979 and 1984, the real value of those benefits declined in nearly every state.

Benefits Provide No Escape from Poverty in 1979

In 1979, income levels provided through AFDC in every state were far below official estimates of the amount necessary to maintain a minimal standard of living. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the U.S. Department of Labor, the "lower budget" for a family of four in 1979 was \$12,585. In the same year, the poverty threshold, which is not based on the actual price of goods and services, was \$7,386 for a family of four.

Differences in states' maximum AFDC payment varied enormously in 1979, yet on an annual basis, all were below the poverty threshold and far below the lower budget. A four-person family with no countable income living in Hawaii, the most generous state, received \$546 per month in 1979. This provided a total annual income of \$6,552, 89 percent of the poverty level for a four-person family in 1979, and 52 percent of the lower budget.^{1/}

In 1979, a similar family in Mississippi, the least generous state, received a meager \$120 per month, for an annual income of \$1,440, 19 percent of the poverty level and only 11 percent of the lower budget.

In 1984, Poor Families Fall Deeper into Poverty

Table III-9 shows the change in the inflation-adjusted value of the maximum monthly AFDC payment for a four-person family between 1979 and 1984, and between 1979 and 1986.

^{1/} Separate poverty thresholds are also calculated for Hawaii and Alaska. In 1979, the poverty threshold for a four-person family in Hawaii was \$7,710. The maximum AFDC benefit over 12 months would have provided 85 percent of this amount.

TABLE III-9
Maximum AFDC Benefit for A Four-Person Family by State:
1979, 1984, and 1986

| | July 1979 | January 1984 | January 1986 | Percent Change 79-84 in Constant Dollars | Percent Change 79-86 in Constant Dollars |
|----------------|--------------|-----------------|-----------------|--|--|
| Alabama | 148 | 147 | 147 | -28% | -34% |
| Alaska | 450 | 775 | 823 | 24% | 22% |
| Arizona | 239 | 282 | 353 | -15% | -1% |
| Arkansas | 188 | 191 | 224 | -27% | -21% |
| California | 487 | 625 | 698 | -8% | -4% |
| Colorado | 327 | 408 | 420 | -10% | -14% |
| Connecticut | 446 | 549 | 617 | -11% | -8% |
| Delaware | 287 | 336 | 349 | -15% | -19% |
| Dist. of Col. | 349 | 366 | 399 | -24% | -24% |
| Florida | 230 | 273 | 298 | -15% | -14% |
| Georgia | 170 | 238 | 264 | 1% | 3% |
| Hawaii | 546 | 546 | 546 | -28% | -33% |
| Idaho | 367 | 345 | 344 | -32% | -37% |
| Illinois 1/ | 333 | 368 | 385 | -20% | -23% |
| Indiana | 275 | 318 | 316 | -17% | -23% |
| Iowa | 419 | 419 | 443 | -28% | -29% |
| Kansas 1/ | 350 | 411 | 450 | -15% | -14% |
| Kentucky | 235 | 235 | 246 | -28% | -30% |
| Louisiana 1/ | 187 | 234 | 234 | -10% | -17% |
| Maine | 332 | 430 | 489 | -7% | -2% |
| Maryland | 294 | 355 | 395 | -13% | -10% |
| Massachusetts | 379 | 445 | 505 | -15% | -11% |
| Michigan 1/ 2/ | 470 | 465 | 536 | -29% | -24% |
| Minnesota | 454 | 583 | 616 | -8% | -9% |
| Mississippi | 120 | 120 | 144 | -28% | -20% |
| Missouri | 270 | 305 | 320 | -19% | -21% |
| Montana | 331 | 425 | 426 | -8% | -14% |
| Nebraska | 370 | 420 | 420 | -18% | -24% |
| Nevada | 297 | 272 | 341 | -34% | -23% |
| New Hampshire | 392 | 389 | 442 | -28% | -25% |

1/ Area differentials exist within the State's maximum payment. Figures given represent the largest caseload areas.

2/ Data for Michigan obtained by the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families.

TABLE III-9 (continued)
Maximum AFDC Benefit for A Four-Person Family by State:
1979, 1984, and 1986

| | July 1979 | January 1984 | January 1986 | Percent Change 79-84 in Constant Dollars | Percent Change 79-86 in Constant Dollars |
|----------------------------|--------------|-----------------|-----------------|--|--|
| New Jersey | 386 | 414 | 465 | -23% | -20% |
| New Mexico | 242 | 313 | 313 | -7% | -14% |
| New York ^{1/} | 476 | 566 | 596 | -14% | -16% |
| North Carolina | 210 | 221 | 269 | -24% | -16% |
| North Dakota | 389 | 437 | 454 | -19% | -22% |
| Ohio | 327 | 343 | 374 | -24% | -24% |
| Oklahoma | 349 | 349 | 394 | -28% | -25% |
| Oregon | 369 | 445 | 482 | -13% | -13% |
| Pennsylvania ^{1/} | 373 | 415 | 466 | -20% | -17% |
| Rhode Island ^{2/} | 389 | 421 | 467 | -22% | -20% |
| South Carolina | 142 | 174 | 239 | -12% | 12% |
| South Dakota | 361 | 361 | 371 | -28% | -31% |
| Tennessee | 148 | 154 | 186 | -25% | -16% |
| Texas | 140 | 178 | 221 | -8% | 5% |
| Utah | 389 | 416 | 439 | -23% | -25% |
| Vermont | 524 | 592 | 651 | -19% | -17% |
| Virginia | 284 | 360 | 410 | -9% | -4% |
| Washington | 483 | 544 | 578 | -19% | -20% |
| West Virginia | 249 | 249 | 312 | -28% | -17% |
| Wisconsin | 458 | 612 | 649 | -4% | -6% |
| Wyoming | 340 | 355 | 390 | -25% | -23% |

^{1/} Area differentials exist within the State's maximum payment. Figures given represent the largest caseload areas.

^{2/} Standards are seasonally adjusted. Figures given are for the non-winter period.

Source: 1979 data from AFDC Standards for Basic Needs, July 1979, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. 1984 and 1986 data from Congressional Research Service surveys.

Despite the already inadequate benefit levels in 1979, in 49 states, the maximum value of APDC benefits failed to keep pace with inflation between 1979 and 1984.

Between 1979 and 1984, the average maximum benefit for a family of four declined by 17 percent in real terms.

Of the 49 states in which the real value of APDC maximum benefits declined between 1979 and 1984, the greatest fall occurred in Nevada, where the value of the highest payment dropped by over one-third (34 percent).

In 12 other states, Alabama, Arkansas, Hawaii, Idaho, Iowa, Kentucky, Mississippi, New Hampshire, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Tennessee, and West Virginia, the maximum benefit declined by 25 percent or more.

The significant erosion in benefit values in five of these 12 states came despite already extremely low maximum benefit values in 1979. In that year, the maximum payment for a four-person family with no income in Alabama, Arkansas, Mississippi, Tennessee, and West Virginia was below \$250 per month. In Mississippi, the state with the very lowest maximum payment in 1979, no allowance for inflation in the cost of consumer goods was made, forcing a needy adult and three children to survive in 1984 on the same \$120 per month that a similar family received in 1979.

The only states in which the real value of the maximum payment rose between 1979 and 1984 were Alaska (up 24 percent), and Georgia (up 1 percent).

Benefit Erosion through 1986

In 24 states, including the District of Columbia, the value of AFDC benefits either just kept pace with inflation or declined still further between 1984 and 1986. Between 1979 and 1986, maximum benefit levels have declined by 20 percent or more in nearly half (24) of all states.

The decline in the real value of the maximum benefit was greatest in Idaho, followed closely by Alabama, Hawaii, South Dakota, and Iowa.

1979-1984 DECLINE IN PARTICIPATION RATES LINKED TO LOWER REAL PAYMENT STANDARDS AND FEDERAL POLICY CHANGES

The degree to which states' provide AFDC income assistance to low-income children and families is, in part, determined by state "payment standards." The payment standard is the amount of income, varied by family size, used by states to determine AFDC eligibility.^{1/}

^{1/} To be eligible for AFDC benefits, a family must have "counted income" below the state's need standard. Counted income is the amount of income left after child care, work expenses and other deductions are taken. The need standard is the amount of income the state determines is necessary to meet a minimal standard of living in that state for a family of a specified size.

However, to be eligible for actual AFDC payments, the family's counted income must also be below the State's payment standard. The payment standard is the actual sum from which countable income of an AFDC recipient is deducted to determine the amount, if any, of the AFDC payment for the family.

So, for example, a California family consisting of one adult and three children with no countable income and few assets applying for AFDC assistance in March, 1984, would receive the maximum payment of \$660.

If the same family had \$300 in earnings, and no allowable child care or work-related deductions, the first \$30 plus one-third of the remaining \$270 of income (\$90) would be excluded, and the remaining \$180 would be subtracted from the payment standard (\$660 -- equal to the maximum benefit) leaving \$480 as the family's AFDC payment for that month.

Under current law, the initial \$30 deduction is limited to 12 months, and the one-third deduction is limited to four months. See p. 95, Appendix C, for discussion of other rules and recent amendments affecting AFDC eligibility.

Payment Standards Highly Correlated with Participation Rates

Variation across states in rates of participation is very closely related to significant differences in state AFDC payment standards.

Table III-10 provides the percentage of low-income children receiving AFDC benefits in each state and payment standards for a four-person family in 1979, as well as the state's rank on these two variables.

States with low payment standards (in effect restricting AFDC participation to families with extremely low incomes) generally had low levels of participation, while states with higher payment standards had higher participation.^{1/}

Just as importantly, because the payment standard is identical to the maximum benefit in most states, participation rates and the maximum payment (for families without income) were also positively correlated. Thus, in states where the lowest percentages of children receive AFDC benefits -- generally in the South -- benefits received by those few who are served are among the most meager.

Eligibility Standards Decline, More Poor Families Are without Assistance

Between 1979 and 1984, the nominal value of the median state payment standard rose from \$340 to \$379, an increase of \$39, or 11 percent (Table III-11).

^{1/} A test of the strength of the correlation between state's rank on the payment standard and participation variables showed a positive, statistically significant relationship (Spearman's Rho = .38, $p < .01$). As would be expected, the relationship between state's rank for participation and maximum benefits was also statistically significant (Spearman's Rho = .35, $p < .01$).

TABLE III-10
Number and Percentage of Low-Income Children Receiving AFDC benefits
and Payment Standard for One Needy Adult and Three Children
by State: 1979

| | AFDC Participation | | Rank | AFDC Payment Standard | |
|----------------------|---|--|------|---|------|
| | Children Receiving AFDC Payments | Percentage of Poor Children Receiving Payments ^{1/} | | Payment Standard for A Four Person Family | Rank |
| UNITED STATES | 7,065,785 | 71% | | | |
| Alabama | 127,332 | 47% | 36 | \$148 | 49 |
| Alaska | 9,955 | 64% | 23 | \$450 | 9 |
| Arizona | 34,319 | 27% | 50 | \$239 | 41 |
| Arkansas | 64,348 | 42% | 41 | \$188 | 46 |
| California | 925,608 | 98% | 11 | \$487 | 3 |
| Colorado | 55,515 | 61% | 25 | \$327 ^{2/} | 30 |
| Connecticut | 94,216 | 102% | 7 | \$446 | 10 |
| Delaware | 22,702 | 89% | 14 | \$287 | 35 |
| Dist. of Columbia | 61,645 | 164% | 1 | \$349 | 24 |
| Florida | 168,115 | 39% | 45 | \$230 | 43 |
| Georgia | 150,764 | 44% | 39 | \$170 | 48 |
| Hawaii | 39,442 | 112% | 5 | \$546 | 1 |
| Idaho | 13,682 | 32% | 49 | \$367 | 21 |
| Illinois | 478,867 | 100% | 8 | \$333 | 27 |
| Indiana | 105,553 | 56% | 27 | \$327 | 30 |
| Iowa | 62,560 | 67% | 21 | \$419 | 11 |
| Kansas | 46,521 | 64% | 24 | \$350 | 23 |
| Kentucky | 116,292 | 51% | 32 | \$235 | 42 |
| Louisiana | 149,777 | 49% | 33 | \$187 | 47 |
| Maine | 40,306 | 81% | 17 | \$332 | 28 |
| Maryland | 142,242 | 99% | 9 | \$294 | 34 |
| Massachusetts | 235,834 | 122% | 2 | \$379 | 17 |
| Michigan | 430,765 | 119% | 3 | \$470 | 6 |
| Minnesota | 87,780 | 74% | 18 | \$454 | 8 |
| Mississippi | 128,075 | 52% | 30 | \$252 | 38 |

^{1/} Percentages above 100% in some states reflect differences in reporting periods for poverty and AFDC participation data. See Appendix B, p. 91, for discussion.

^{2/} Payment standard for April-October. Payment standard for November-March was \$347.

TABLE III-10 (continued)
 Number and Percentage of Low-Income Children Receiving AFDC Benefits
 and Payment Standard for One Needy Adult and Three Children
 by State: 1979

| | AFDC Participation | | | AFDC Payment Standard | |
|----------------|---|---|------|---|------|
| | Children Receiving AFDC Payments | Percentage of Poor Children Receiving Payments 1/ | Rank | Payment Standard for A Four Person Family | Rank |
| Missouri | 132,732 | 68% | 20 | \$270 | 37 |
| Montana | 12,396 | 39% | 44 | \$331 | 29 |
| Nebraska | 25,155 | 48% | 34 | \$370 | 19 |
| Nevada | 6,962 | 34% | 48 | \$297 | 33 |
| New Hampshire | 14,164 | 59% | 26 | \$392 | 12 |
| New Jersey | 319,258 | 115% | 4 | \$386 | 16 |
| New Mexico | 36,038 | 40% | 42 | \$242 | 40 |
| New York | 773,464 | 88% | 15 | \$476 | 5 |
| North Carolina | 139,118 | 47% | 38 | \$210 | 45 |
| North Dakota | 9,187 | 34% | 47 | \$389 | 13 |
| Ohio | 330,673 | 82% | 16 | \$327 | 30 |
| Oklahoma | 62,423 | 47% | 35 | \$349 | 24 |
| Oregon | 76,943 | 91% | 13 | \$369 | 20 |
| Pennsylvania | 412,120 | 97% | 12 | \$373 | 18 |
| Rhode Island | 34,447 | 106% | 6 | \$389 2/ | 13 |
| South Carolina | 103,198 | 53% | 29 | \$229 | 44 |
| South Dakota | 14,721 | 36% | 46 | \$361 | 22 |
| Tennessee | 114,608 | 43% | 40 | \$148 | 49 |
| Texas | 212,205 | 27% | 51 | \$140 | 51 |
| Utah | 26,552 | 47% | 37 | \$389 | 13 |
| Vermont | 13,230 | 66% | 22 | \$524 | 2 |
| Virginia | 114,429 | 51% | 31 | \$284 | 36 |
| Washington | 91,256 | 71% | 19 | \$483 | 4 |
| West Virginia | 56,125 | 55% | 28 | \$249 | 39 |
| Wisconsin | 137,791 | 99% | 10 | \$458 | 7 |
| Wyoming | 4,375 | 40% | 43 | \$340 | 26 |

- 1/ Percentages above 100% in some states reflect differences in reporting periods for poverty and AFDC participation data. See Appendix B, p. 91, for discussion.
- 2/ Payment standard for April-November. Payment standard for November-March was \$518.

TABLE III-11
AFDC Need Standard and Payment Standard
for A One-Parent Family of Four Persons: 1979, 1984, and 1985

| State | July, 1979 | | July, 1984 | | July, 1985 | |
|---------------|------------------|---------------------|------------------|---------------------|------------------|---------------------|
| | Need Standard | Payment Standard | Need Standard | Payment Standard | Need Standard | Payment Standard |
| Alabama | \$240 | \$148 | \$480 | \$147 | \$480 | \$147 |
| Alaska | 450 | 450 | 775 | 775 | 800 | 800 |
| Arizona | 282 | 239 | 282 | 282 | 282 | 282 |
| Arkansas | 273 | 188 | 273 | 191 | 273 | 224 |
| California | 511 | 487 | 660 | 660 | 698 | 698 |
| Colorado | 327 | 327 | 510 | 510 | 664 | 664 |
| Connecticut | 446 | 446 | 636 | 636 | 664 | 664 |
| Delaware | 287 | 287 | 336 | 336 | 336 | 336 |
| Dist. of Col. | 481 | 349 | 715 | 366 | 798 | 399 |
| Florida | 230 | 230 | 468 | 273 | 268 | 284 |
| Georgia | 227 | 170 | 432 | 295 | 432 | 264 |
| Hawaii | 546 | 546 | 546 | 546 | 546 | 546 |
| Idaho | 421 | 367 | 627 | 344 | 627 | 344 |
| Illinois | 333 | 333 | 713 | 368 | 742 | 385 |
| Indiana | 363 | 327 | 363 | 326 | 363 | 326 |
| Iowa | 419 | 419 | 578 | 419 | 578 | 419 |
| Kansas | 350 | 350 | 422 | 422 | 446 | 446 |
| Kentucky | 235 | 235 | 246 | 246 | 246 | 246 |
| Louisiana | 495 | 187 | 661 | 234 | 712 | 234 |
| Maine | 349 | 332 | 623 | 452 | 641 | 641 |
| Maryland | 314 | 294 | 520 | 376 | 546 | 395 |
| Massachusetts | 480 | 379 | 735 | 463 | 515 | 515 |
| Michigan 1/ | 470 | 470 | 598 | 465 | 658 | 512 |
| Minnesota | 454 | 454 | 611 | 611 | 616 | 616 |
| Mississippi | 252 | 252 | 327 | 327 | 327 | 327 |

1/ Data for Michigan obtained by the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families

10

33 60

TABLE III-11 (continued)
APDC Need Standard and Payment Standard
for A One-Parent Family of Four Persons: 1979, 1984, and 1985

| State | July, 1979 | | July, 1984 | | July, 1985 | |
|----------------|------------------|---------------------|------------------|---------------------|------------------|---------------------|
| | Need Standard | Payment Standard | Need Standard | Payment Standard | Need Standard | Payment Standard |
| Missouri | 365 | 270 | 365 | 308 | 365 | 320 |
| Montana | 331 | 331 | 513 | 425 | 514 | 426 |
| Nebraska | 370 | 370 | 420 | 420 | 420 | 420 |
| Nevada | 341 | 297 | 341 | 272 | 341 | 341 |
| New Hampshire | 392 | 392 | 429 | 429 | 442 | 442 |
| New Jersey | 386 | 386 | 443 | 443 | 465 | 465 |
| New Mexico | 242 | 242 | 313 | 313 | 313 | 313 |
| New York | 476 | 476 | 566 | 566 | 566 | 566 |
| North Carolina | 210 | 210 | 442 | 221 | 538 | 269 |
| North Dakota | 389 | 389 | 437 | 437 | 454 | 454 |
| Ohio | 431 | 327 | 757 | 343 | 809 | 360 |
| Oklahoma | 349 | 349 | 349 | 349 | 583 | 349 |
| Oregon | 462 | 369 | 446 | 446 | 468 | 468 |
| Pennsylvania | 373 | 373 | 675 | 415 | 749 | 444 |
| Rhode Island | 389 | 389 | 440 | 440 | 467 | 467 |
| South Carolina | 229 | 229 | 229 | 229 | 229 | 229 |
| South Dakota | 361 | 361 | 371 | 371 | 371 | 371 |
| Tennessee | 217 | 148 | 300 | 168 | 413 | 186 |
| Texas | 187 | 140 | 593 | 178 | 593 | 201 |
| Utah | 519 | 389 | 802 | 802 | 809 | 809 |
| Vermont | 656 | 524 | 951 | 622 | 985 | 651 |
| Virginia | 315 | 284 | 422 | 379 | 457 | 410 |
| Washington | 483 | 483 | 904 | 561 | 914 | 561 |
| West Virginia | 332 | 249 | 332 | 249 | 623 | 312 |
| Wisconsin | 520 | 458 | 749 | 636 | 749 | 636 |
| Wyoming | 340 | 340 | 310 | 310 | 390 | 390 |
| Median State | | 340 | | 379 | | 399 |

Source: 1979 data from APDC Standards for Basic Needs, July 1979, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. 1984 and 1985 data from Congressional Research Service surveys.

52

61

However, after accounting for inflation, this change represents a 23 percent decline in the median state payment standard.

As a result, although the numbers of families falling into poverty increased, and more and more families with already marginal incomes fell below inflation-adjusted poverty thresholds, hundreds of thousands of families found that their inadequate incomes remained above AFDC payment eligibility standards. These families faced poverty, many perhaps for the first time, with no recourse to income assistance through AFDC.^{1/}

Working Poor Families Abandoned by AFDC

At the same time that state eligibility standards were narrowing in the face of rising poverty, federal AFDC policies concerning eligibility and benefits also changed, affecting hundreds of thousands of families and children.

^{1/} In addition to AFDC, nearly all states and the District of Columbia operate General Assistance (GA) programs. GA is a generic term used to comprise all state and local programs of continuing or emergency income assistance. These programs are legislated, designed and funded at the state and local level. No federal funds are provided for GA.

GA programs serve as the ultimate "safety net" for low-income individuals and families who are not eligible for AFDC or other federally-supported assistance programs. Beyond the common generic term and the state and local control, however, GA programs have few common characteristics. Eligibility criteria vary from strict disability requirements to broad income requirements with no categorical restrictions. Benefit levels vary from small one-time payments to regular payments virtually identical to AFDC.

As of late 1982, 25 jurisdictions, including Washington, D.C., operated statewide GA programs, fully funded by the state. Nineteen states provided no funds for local relief programs, although four of these states required their localities to offer GA. One state, West Virginia, had no cash GA program, having ended state funding for it in 1980. The remaining nine states generally shared GA costs with localities.

According to the U.S. General Accounting Office, 442,000 fewer AFDC cases were opened after 1981 than would have been expected to be opened because of restrictions imposed on AFDC eligibility under the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 (OBRA).^{1/}

The number of children affected was not reported. However, given that the average number of children in AFDC families was two in 1984, it can be estimated that nearly 900,000 low-income children were denied benefits because of OBRA changes.

Of the 22 provisions in OBRA which affected the AFDC program, GAO identified six that had the most effect on program participation:

- A limitation on gross income to 150 percent of the state "need standard" (the amount of income determined by the state as necessary to meet a minimal standard of living);
- The imposition of a 4-month limit on an existing provision in which the first \$30 of earned-income and one-third of the remainder were disregarded in the calculation of AFDC benefits;
- The placement of a \$75 ceiling on work-expense deductions for full-time employment;
- The placement of a \$160 ceiling on the child-care expense deduction for each child;
- The inclusion of the income of stepparents; and
- The limitation of assets to \$1,000.

^{1/} In An Evaluation of the 1981 AFDC Changes: Final Report, published July 2, 1985, the GAO reported that OBRA changes affected working AFDC recipients disproportionately. For example, among the five sites studied, 39-60 percent of AFDC earner cases (that is, cases that included workers) were closed and an additional 8-48 percent of earner cases had their grants reduced. The comparable figures for non-earner cases were 1-12 percent closed and an additional 1-6 percent were reduced.

See Appendix C, p. 96, for discussion of OBRA and more recent amendments affecting AFDC eligibility and payment levels.

CHAPTER IV: CHILDREN'S PARTICIPATION IN HEAD START

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

- In 1984, 15 percent of all low-income children ages 3 to 5 were enrolled in Head Start, down by 25 percent from the percentage of impoverished children served in 1979. In 1979, 20 percent were enrolled (p. 56).
- In 1984, 862 counties, 28 percent of all U.S. counties had no Head Start program (p. 56).
- In one-fourth of all the Child Poverty Counties, no Head Start program existed in 1984 (p. 63).
- One hundred ninety-one (31 percent) of all Child Poverty Counties had high Head Start participation in 1984 (p. 63).
- Wide disparities in Head Start participation existed between states. The average of the top ten states' scores on a Head Start Participation Scale was nearly 2-1/2 times greater than the average of the lowest ten states' scores (p. 58).

CHAPTER IV: CHILDREN'S PARTICIPATION IN HEAD START

This section provides data on the total number and percentage of low-income children enrolled in Head Start in the U.S. in 1984, and on the number of counties where no children were enrolled.

NATIONALLY, PERCENTAGE OF LOW-INCOME CHILDREN SERVED BY
HEAD START FALLS BY 25 PERCENT SINCE 1979.
IN OVER 850 COUNTIES, NO CHILDREN WERE ENROLLED IN 1984.

During the 1983-1984 school year (September, 1983 - August, 1984), 395,439 children were enrolled in Head Start in the United States (Table IV-1).^{1/} This figure represents only 15 percent of the 2,553,000 three, four, and five year old children living in families with incomes below the poverty level in 1984.

The low level of participation in 1984 reflects a 25 percent decline in the percentage of low-income children served since 1979. In the 1978-1979 school year (September, 1978 - August, 1979), 322,723 children were enrolled in Head Start, 20 percent of all low-income children ages 3-5 in 1979.^{1/}

The extremely low national rate of Head Start participation in 1984 reflected the fact that in 862 counties, 28 percent of all U.S. counties, no Head Start program existed.^{2/}

^{1/} Figures include up to 10 percent non-poor children. Figures exclude children enrolled in Head Start in Puerto Rico, U.S. Virgin Islands and other U.S. territories, or in programs that ran only during the summer.

^{2/} In FY 1985, 153 Head Start programs were begun in counties where no program existed previously. These counties are noted in Appendix G, Table G-2.

TABLE IV-1
Summary by State: Children Participating in Head Start

| State | Children Enrolled in Head Start 1984 | State | Children Enrolled in Head Start 1984 |
|----------------------|---|----------------|---|
| <u>United States</u> | 395,439 | | |
| Alabama | 9,908 | Missouri | 7,904 |
| Alaska | 1,131 | Montana | 2,068 |
| Arizona | 8,632 | Nebraska | 1,868 |
| Arkansas | 5,628 | Nevada | 651 |
| California | 32,339 | New Hampshire | 670 |
| Colorado | 5,365 | New Jersey | 9,510 |
| Connecticut | 4,189 | New Mexico | 5,187 |
| Delaware | 899 | New York | 24,393 |
| Dist. of Col. | 1,705 | North Carolina | 10,740 |
| Florida | 13,082 | North Dakota | 1,273 |
| Georgia | 9,717 | Ohio | 20,214 |
| Hawaii | 1,257 | Oklahoma | 7,977 |
| Idaho | 1,589 | Oregon | 3,330 |
| Illinois | 23,019 | Pennsylvania | 15,128 |
| Indiana | 6,832 | Rhode Island | 1,409 |
| Iowa | 3,025 | South Carolina | 6,238 |
| Kansas | 2,715 | South Dakota | 1,541 |
| Kentucky | 10,288 | Tennessee | 8,375 |
| Louisiana | 9,279 | Texas | 23,889 |
| Maine | 1,584 | Utah | 2,271 |
| Maryland | 5,093 | Vermont | 899 |
| Massachusetts | 7,761 | Virginia | 5,191 |
| Michigan | 20,248 | Washington | 5,072 |
| Minnesota | 5,244 | West Virginia | 3,677 |
| Mississippi | 28,180 | Wisconsin | 6,479 |
| | | Wyoming | 776 |

Source: Head Start Funding Guidance Records, Administration for
Children, Youth and Families, U.S. Department of Health and
Human Services

STATES SHOW WIDE DIFFERENCES IN OVERALL HEAD START PARTICIPATION

This section compares participation across states using a Head Start Participation Scale. The Participation Scale reflects the percentage of Head Start High Participation Counties minus the percentage of Low Participation Counties in each state. High Participation Counties are the top quintile of all counties when the number of children enrolled is compared to the number of low-income children ages 3-5 in the county (Table G-1, Appendix G, summarized in Table IV-2). Low Participation Counties are the lowest quintile of all counties (Table G-2, Appendix G, summarized in Table IV-3).^{1/}

Similar to AFDC participation in 1984, the disparity in levels of participation between scores of the highest and lowest ten states was very substantial. The average of the top ten states' scores, 32.5, was nearly 2-1/2 times as high as the average for the lowest ten states, -45. Mississippi's score, highest of all states, was nearly five times greater than Kansas' score, lowest of all states (Table IV-4).

In Mississippi, 73 of the state's 82 counties (89 percent) were Head Start High Participation Counties and no counties were Head Start Low Participation Counties.

^{1/} The determination of county participation levels utilized 1984 program participation data, however, county level poverty statistics are drawn from the 1980 Decennial Census, the most recent source for these data. See Appendix B, p. 87, for further discussion. In the case of Head Start Low Participation Counties, however, all counties served no children in 1984. Because of the high number of counties that had no Head Start program (862) the lowest quintile extends to 28 percent of all counties rather than the lowest 20 percent.

TABLE IV-2
Summary by State: 1984 Head Start High Participation Counties
(N = 622)

| State and Total No. of Counties <u>1/</u> | High Participation Counties and Percent of All Counties | State and Total No. of Counties <u>1/</u> | High Participation Counties and Percent of All Counties |
|---|---|---|---|
| Alabama (67) | 12 (18%) | Missouri (115) | 27 (23%) |
| Alaska (1) | 0 (0%) | Montana (57) | 16 (17%) |
| Arizona (14) | 6 (43%) | Nebraska (93) | 12 (13%) |
| Arkansas (75) | 20 (27%) | Nevada (17) | 5 (29%) |
| California (58) | 7 (12%) | New Hampshire (10) | 0 (0%) |
| Colorado (63) | 15 (24%) | New Jersey (21) | 0 (0%) |
| Connecticut (8) | 0 (0%) | New Mexico (32) | 16 (50%) |
| Delaware (3) | 0 (0%) | New York (62) | 4 (6%) |
| Dist. of Col. (1) | 0 (0%) | North Carolina (100) | 17 (17%) |
| Florida (67) | 6 (9%) | North Dakota (53) | 4 (7%) |
| Georgia (159) | 34 (21%) | Ohio (82) | 18 (20%) |
| Hawaii (4) | 0 (0%) | Oklahoma (77) | 37 (48%) |
| Idaho (44) | 4 (9%) | Oregon (36) | 2 (6%) |
| Illinois (102) | 12 (12%) | Pennsylvania (67) | 6 (9%) |
| Indiana (92) | 10 (11%) | Rhode Island (5) | 0 (0%) |
| Iowa (99) | 7 (7%) | South Carolina (46) | 10 (22%) |
| Kansas (105) | 10 (9%) | South Dakota (66) | 12 (18%) |
| Kentucky (120) | 36 (30%) | Tennessee (95) | 22 (23%) |
| Louisiana (64) | 11 (17%) | Texas (253) | 41 (16%) |
| Maine (16) | 2 (13%) | Utah (29) | 4 (14%) |
| Maryland (24) | 9 (38%) | Vermont (14) | 3 (21%) |
| Massachusetts (14) | 0 (0%) | Virginia (136) | 18 (13%) |
| Michigan (83) | 27 (32%) | Washington (39) | 4 (10%) |
| Minnesota (87) | 17 (19%) | West Virginia (55) | 7 (13%) |
| Mississippi (82) | 73 (89%) | Wisconsin (72) | 17 (24%) |
| | | Wyoming (23) | 8 (35%) |

1/ Counties in which no low-income children resided have been excluded.

TABLE IV-3
Summary by State: 1984 Head Start Low Participation Counties
(N = 862)

| State and Total No. of Counties <u>1/</u> | Low Participation Counties and Percent of All Counties | State and Total No. of Counties <u>1/</u> | Low Participation Counties and Percent of All Counties |
|---|--|---|--|
| Alabama (67) | 21 (31%) | Missouri (115) | 3 (3%) |
| Alaska (1) | 0 (0%) | Montana (57) | 39 (68%) |
| Arizona (14) | 0 (0%) | Nebraska (93) | 58 (62%) |
| Arkansas (75) | 12 (16%) | Nevada (17) | 7 (41%) |
| California (58) | 7 (12%) | New Hampshire (10) | 0 (0%) |
| Colorado (63) | 37 (59%) | New Jersey (21) | 0 (0%) |
| Connecticut (8) | 0 (0%) | New Mexico (32) | 9 (28%) |
| Delaware (3) | 0 (0%) | New York (62) | 9 (14%) |
| Dist. of Col. (1) | 0 (0%) | North Carolina (100) | 22 (22%) |
| Florida (67) | 19 (28%) | North Dakota (53) | 35 (66%) |
| Georgia (159) | 51 (32%) | Ohio (88) | 2 (2%) |
| Hawaii (4) | 0 (0%) | Oklahoma (77) | 15 (19%) |
| Idaho (44) | 21 (48%) | Oregon (36) | 15 (42%) |
| Illinois (102) | 21 (21%) | Pennsylvania (67) | 4 (6%) |
| Indiana (92) | 39 (42%) | Rhode Island (5) | 0 (0%) |
| Iowa (99) | 12 (12%) | South Carolina (46) | 0 (0%) |
| Kansas (105) | 72 (69%) | South Dakota (66) | 19 (29%) |
| Kentucky (120) | 17 (14%) | Tennessee (95) | 12 (13%) |
| Louisiana (64) | 25 (40%) | Texas (253) | 123 (49%) |
| Maine (16) | 0 (0%) | Utah (29) | 16 (55%) |
| Maryland (24) | 1 (4%) | Vermont (14) | 1 (7%) |
| Massachusetts (14) | 1 (7%) | Virginia (136) | 77 (57%) |
| Michigan (83) | 0 (0%) | Washington (39) | 10 (26%) |
| Minnesota (87) | 5 (6%) | West Virginia (55) | 6 (11%) |
| Mississippi (82) | 0 (0%) | Wisconsin (72) | 9 (13%) |
| | | Wyoming (23) | 10 (43%) |

1/ Counties in which no low-income children resided have been excluded.

TABLE IV-4
1984 Head Start Participation Scores and Rank by State

| State | Score | Rank <u>1/</u> | State | Score | Rank <u>1/</u> |
|----------------|-------|----------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Mississippi | 89 | 1 | Iowa | -5 | 28 |
| Arizona | 43 | 2 | North Carolina | -5 | 28 |
| Maryland | 34 | 3 | Massachusetts | -7 | 30 |
| Michigan | 32 | 4 | New York | -8 | 31 |
| Oklahoma | 29 | 5 | Wyoming | -8 | 31 |
| South Carolina | 22 | 6 | Illinois | -9 | 33 |
| New Mexico | 22 | 6 | South Dakota | -11 | 34 |
| Missouri | 20 | 8 | Georgia | -11 | 34 |
| Ohio | 18 | 9 | Nevada | -12 | 36 |
| Kentucky | 16 | 10 | Alabama | -13 | 37 |
| Vermont | 14 | 11 | Washington | -16 | 38 |
| Maine | 13 | 12 | Florida | -19 | 39 |
| Minnesota | 13 | 12 | Louisiana | -23 | 40 |
| Wisconsin | 11 | 14 | Indiana | -31 | 41 |
| Arkansas | 11 | 14 | Texas | -33 | 42 |
| Tennessee | 10 | 16 | Colorado | -35 | 43 |
| Pennsylvania | 3 | 17 | Oregon | -36 | 44 |
| West Virginia | 2 | 18 | Idaho | -39 | 45 |
| New Hampshire | 0 | 19 | Utah | -41 | 46 |
| New Jersey | 0 | 19 | Virginia | -44 | 47 |
| Connecticut | 0 | 19 | Nebraska | -49 | 48 |
| Delaware | 0 | 19 | Montana | -51 | 49 |
| Dist. of Col. | 0 | 19 | North Dakota | -59 | 50 |
| Alaska | 0 | 19 | Kansas | -60 | 51 |
| California | 0 | 19 | | | |
| Hawaii | 0 | 19 | | | |
| Rhode Island | 0 | 19 | | | |

1/ States with equal scores received equal ranks.

In contrast, nearly all other states that achieved the top Head Start Participation Scores had relatively few counties with high levels of support. Among the next six highest scoring states (Arizona, Maryland, Michigan, Oklahoma, South Carolina, and New Mexico), only New Mexico had a majority of High Participation Counties.

Very low Head Start Participation scores in two midwestern states (Kansas and North Dakota) reflected the fact that at least two-thirds of the counties in each of these states had no Head Start program in 1984. In both states, Head Start High Participation Counties comprised less than 10 percent of all counties.

In another five of the lowest scoring states (Montana, Nebraska, Virginia, Utah, and Colorado) well over half of all counties had no Head Start program in 1984. (Nearly 60 percent of Colorado's counties had no Head Start program although nearly one-fourth of the state's counties had high levels of Head Start enrollment.)

Overall, half of the lowest ten states were western states, reflecting the generally low level of Head Start participation in the region.

HIGH HEAD START PARTICIPATION IN LESS THAN THIRTY PERCENT
OF THE POOREST COUNTIES, WHILE ONE-FOURTH HAVE
NO HEAD START AT ALL

This section describes the relationship between poverty and children's participation in Head Start at the county level. Those counties that were both Child Poverty Counties -- counties with poverty rates above 25 percent in 1979 -- and Head Start High Participation Counties are described first, followed by counties that were both Child Poverty Counties and Head Start Low Participation Counties.

High Enrollment Lacking in Most Poor Counties

Counties with the highest rates of poverty were generally not those with the highest levels of Head Start participation. Across the Nation, only 191 Child Poverty Counties (31 percent) were also Head Start High Participation Counties (Table G-3, Appendix G).

Thus, Head Start enrollment was relatively strong in less than one-third of the counties where poverty among children was most concentrated. In this respect, Head Start participation closely paralleled AFDC participation for low-income children: support services were not concentrated in those areas with the greatest level of need.

However, there were some notable exceptions to this trend. In Mississippi, the state with the highest concentration of poor children, 90 percent of the state's Child Poverty Counties were Head Start High Participation Counties as well.

Several other states had significant numbers of Child Poverty Counties that were also High Participation Counties. These included Missouri (8 of 19, or 42 percent), New Mexico (8 of 14, or 57 percent), Oklahoma (14 of 17, or 82 percent) and West Virginia (4 of 10, or 40 percent). The two Arizona Child Poverty Counties, and the one Michigan Child Poverty County were also High Participation Counties.

Zero Participation in One-Quarter of the Poorest Counties

In 1984, in 154, or 25 percent, of the U.S. counties with the most child poverty, no Head Start program was in existence (Table G-4, Appendix G).

Nineteen states had at least one Child Poverty/Head Start Low Participation County. In four states, over half of all Child Poverty Counties had zero Head Start participation rates, led by Montana, where 6 of 8 Child Poverty Counties (75 percent) were also Head Start Low Participation Counties. The other three states were Virginia (12 of 17, or 70 percent), North Dakota (8 of 13, or 61 percent), and Nebraska (6 of 10, or 60 percent).

In Louisiana, nearly a majority of all Child Poverty Counties were Head Start Low Participation Counties (14 of 30, or 47 percent).

CHAPTER V: CHILDREN'S PARTICIPATION IN WIC

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

- In 1984, one-third of all low-income children under 5 received WIC benefits, up by 22 percent from the percentage of poor children served in 1979. In 1979, 27 percent were served (p. 66).
- In 1984, 332 counties, 11 percent of all U.S. counties had no WIC program (p. 66).
- Only 95 (15 percent) of all the Child Poverty Counties had high WIC participation in 1984 (p. 74).
- Seventeen percent of all Child Poverty Counties (103) were WIC Low Participation Counties. Of these, 40 of the poorest counties (6 percent) had no WIC program (p. 74).
- As in AFDC and Head Start, wide gaps in overall program participation existed among states. The average of the top ten states' scores on a WIC Participation Scale was 2-1/2 times greater than the average of the lowest ten states (p. 68).

CHAPTER V: CHILDREN'S PARTICIPATION IN WIC

This section provides data on the total number and average monthly percentage of low-income children receiving WIC benefits in 1984, and on the number of counties where no children received benefits.

WIC BENEFITS REACHED JUST ONE-THIRD OF ALL POOR CHILDREN,
OVER TEN PERCENT OF ALL COUNTIES SERVED NO CHILDREN

An estimated 1,425,725 poor infants and children participated in the WIC program in the U.S. in March, 1984 ^{1/} (Table V-1). This figure is one-third of the 4,280,000 children under five living in families with incomes below the poverty level in 1984.

Like the Head Start program, the fact that only one-third of all poor children received WIC benefits in 1984 reflects the significant number of counties in which no WIC program existed. Across 19 states, 332 counties or 11 percent of all U.S. counties, had no WIC program for young, low-income children.^{2/} These 332 counties represent over half of all 1984 WIC Low Participation Counties.

While the percentage of low-income children receiving WIC was quite low in 1984, it represented a 22 percent increase in participation

^{1/} WIC income eligibility limits extend to 185 percent of the poverty threshold in most states. The procedure employed to estimate the number of children receiving WIC benefits who fell at or below the poverty line is described in Appendix A, p. 83.

^{2/} As of September, 1986, WIC programs had been instituted in 196 counties in which no children were served in March, 1984. These counties are noted in Table H-2, Appendix H.

In addition, some counties receive a similar program, the Community Supplemental Food Program (CSFP), which provides supplemental food to women, infants and children not participating in the WIC program. The CSFP provides federally-purchased commodities to states which, in turn, distribute these commodities to low-income pregnant, postpartum, and nursing mothers, and infants and children up to age six who are vulnerable to malnutrition. No person may participate in both CSFP and the WIC program at the same time. Counties in which CSFP clinics were in operation during 1984 are noted in Appendix I, Table I-1.

TABLE V-1
Summary by State: Children Participating in WIC

| State | Estimated Number of Poor Children Receiving WIC Benefits March, 1984 | State | Estimated Number of Poor Children Receiving WIC Benefits March, 1984 |
|----------------------|---|----------------|---|
| <u>United States</u> | 1,425,725 | | |
| Alabama | 37,709 | Missouri | 32,262 |
| Alaska | 1,828 | Montana | 4,159 |
| Arizona | 10,839 | Nebraska | 7,723 |
| Arkansas | 15,065 | Nevada | 5,003 |
| California | 79,017 | New Hampshire | 5,749 |
| Colorado | 13,632 | New Jersey | 29,216 |
| Connecticut | 21,629 | New Mexico | 6,234 |
| Delaware | 3,459 | New York | 121,577 |
| Dist. of Col. | 5,764 | North Carolina | 49,198 |
| Florida | 43,449 | North Dakota | 6,662 |
| Georgia | 53,475 | Ohio | 89,406 |
| Hawaii | 2,405 | Oklahoma | 18,184 |
| Idaho | 5,616 | Oregon | 11,603 |
| Illinois | 67,191 | Pennsylvania | 60,878 |
| Indiana | 27,319 | Rhode Island | 6,650 |
| Iowa | 19,708 | South Carolina | 36,488 |
| Kansas | 11,958 | South Dakota | 5,222 |
| Kentucky | 31,238 | Tennessee | 28,798 |
| Louisiana | 41,246 | Texas | 91,346 |
| Maine | 7,801 | Utah | 10,468 |
| Maryland | 28,935 | Vermont | 7,800 |
| Massachusetts | 23,805 | Virginia | 28,480 |
| Michigan | 65,560 | Washington | 15,421 |
| Minnesota | 30,527 | West Virginia | 14,990 |
| Mississippi | 45,663 | Wisconsin | 33,203 |
| | | Wyoming | 3,114 |

Source: Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families Survey.

since 1979. In fiscal year 1979, the average monthly number of low-income infants and children participating in the WIC program was estimated to be 764,000, 27 percent of all poor children under five years old.

BEST AND WORST STATES FAR APART IN WIC SUPPORT

This section describes variation in WIC support across states, based on states' scores on a WIC Participation Scale.

The Participation Scale reflects the percentage of WIC High Participation Counties minus the percentage of Low Participation Counties. WIC High Participation Counties are the top fifth of all counties when the number of children served is compared to the number of low-income children aged 0-4 in the county. (Table H-1, Appendix H, summarized in Table V-2). WIC Low Participation Counties are the lowest fifth of all counties (Table H-2, Appendix H, summarized in Table V-3).^{1/}

WIC Participation Exceptional in Vermont, Strong in Northeast

As with state participation in AFDC and Head Start, the most and least successful states in providing nutritional benefits through WIC had widely divergent scores on the WIC Participation Scale. Similar to Head Start, the average of the top ten states' scores was two and one-half times as high as the average of the lowest ten states.

Vermont, in which all 14 counties were WIC High Participation Counties, had the highest rating of any state on the WIC Participation

^{1/} The determination of county participation levels utilized 1984 program participation data. However, county-level poverty statistics are drawn from the 1980 Decennial Census, the most recent source for these data. See Appendix B, p. 88, for further discussion.

TABLE V-2
Summary by State: 1984 WIC High Participation Counties
(N = 622)

| State and Total No. of Counties ^{1/} | High Participation Counties and Percent of All Counties | State and Total No. of Counties ^{1/} | High Participation Counties and Percent of All Counties |
|---|---|---|---|
| Alabama (67) | 10 (15%) | Missouri (115) | 31 (27%) |
| Alaska (1) | 0 (0%) | Montana (57) | 3 (5%) |
| Arizona (14) | 0 (0%) | Nebraska (93) | 8 (9%) |
| Arkansas (75) | 0 (0%) | Nevada (17) | 9 (53%) |
| California (58) | 7 (12%) | New Hampshire (10) | 4 (40%) |
| Colorado (63) | 14 (22%) | New Jersey (21) | 2 (9%) |
| Connecticut (8) | 2 (25%) | New Mexico (32) | 1 (3%) |
| Delaware (3) | 0 (0%) | New York (58) | 8 (13%) |
| Dist. of Col. (1) | 0 (0%) | North Carolina (100) | 31 (31%) |
| Florida (67) | 6 (9%) | North Dakota (53) | 18 (34%) |
| Georgia (159) | 43 (27%) | Ohio (88) | 30 (34%) |
| Hawaii (4) | 0 (0%) | Oklahoma (77) | 13 (17%) |
| Idaho (44) | 3 (7%) | Oregon (36) | 0 (0%) |
| Illinois (102) | 28 (27%) | Pennsylvania (67) | 11 (16%) |
| Indiana (92) | 18 (20%) | Rhode Island (5) | 1 (20%) |
| Iowa (99) | 14 (14%) | South Carolina (46) | 17 (37%) |
| Kansas (105) | 14 (13%) | South Dakota (66) | 3 (4%) |
| Kentucky (120) | 21 (18%) | Tennessee (95) | 14 (15%) |
| Louisiana (64) | 11 (17%) | Texas (253) | 26 (10%) |
| Maine (16) | 0 (0%) | Utah (29) | 2 (7%) |
| Maryland (24) | 9 (38%) | Vermont (14) | 14 (100%) |
| Massachusetts (14) | 0 (0%) | Virginia (136) | 35 (26%) |
| Michigan (83) | 39 (47%) | Washington (39) | 3 (8%) |
| Minnesota (87) | 23 (26%) | West Virginia (55) | 7 (13%) |
| Mississippi (82) | 25 (30%) | Wisconsin (72) | 34 (47%) |
| | | Wyoming (23) | 10 (43%) |

^{1/} Counties in which no low-income children resided have been excluded.

TABLE V-3
Summary by State: 1984 WIC Low Participation Counties
(N = 621)

| State and Total No. of Counties <u>1/</u> | Low Participation Counties and Percent of All Counties | State and Total No. of Counties <u>1/</u> | Low Participation Counties and Percent of All Counties |
|---|--|---|--|
| Alabama (67) | 2 (3%) | Missouri (115) | 1 (1%) |
| Alaska (1) | 0 (0%) | Montana (57) | 27 (47%) |
| Arizona (14) | 5 (36%) | Nebraska (93) | 41 (44%) |
| Arkansas (75) | 17 (23%) | Nevada (17) | 2 (12%) |
| California (58) | 18 (31%) | New Hampshire (10) | 0 (0%) |
| Colorado (63) | 22 (35%) | New Jersey (21) | 6 (29%) |
| Connecticut (8) | 0 (0%) | New Mexico (32) | 14 (44%) |
| Delaware (3) | 1 (33%) | New York (58) | 2 (3%) |
| Dist. of Col. (1) | 0 (0%) | North Carolina (100) | 0 (0%) |
| Florida (67) | 13 (19%) | North Dakota (53) | 8 (15%) |
| Georgia (159) | 1 (1%) | Ohio (88) | 3 (3%) |
| Hawaii (4) | 3 (75%) | Oklahoma (77) | 16 (21%) |
| Idaho (44) | 18 (41%) | Oregon (36) | 11 (31%) |
| Illinois (102) | 7 (7%) | Pennsylvania (67) | 8 (12%) |
| Indiana (92) | 32 (35%) | Rhode Island (5) | 0 (0%) |
| Iowa (99) | 4 (4%) | South Carolina (46) | 0 (0%) |
| Kansas (105) | 63 (60%) | South Dakota (66) | 21 (32%) |
| Kentucky (120) | 11 (9%) | Tennessee (95) | 3 (3%) |
| Louisiana (64) | 5 (8%) | Texas (253) | 155 (61%) |
| Maine (16) | 1 (6%) | Utah (29) | 6 (21%) |
| Maryland (24) | 0 (0%) | Vermont (14) | 0 (0%) |
| Massachusetts (14) | 2 (14%) | Virginia (136) | 31 (23%) |
| Michigan (83) | 3 (4%) | Washington (39) | 14 (36%) |
| Minnesota (87) | 13 (15%) | West Virginia (55) | 6 (11%) |
| Mississippi (82) | 1 (1%) | Wisconsin (72) | 1 (1%) |
| | | Wyoming (23) | 3 (13%) |

1/ Counties in which no low-income children resided have been excluded.

Scale (Table V-4). This score was eight times higher than the lowest scoring state, Hawaii. Three of Hawaii's four counties in which low-income children resided were Low Participation Counties.

WIC participation at the state level also resembled Head Start, in that apart from Vermont, few states among the top ten in WIC participation actually had significant percentages of WIC High Participation Counties. Among the three states with the next highest scores, Wisconsin, Michigan, and Nevada, only Nevada had a majority of High Participation counties. In fact, no other states had a majority of high serving counties.

High scores on the WIC participation scale among the top ten states primarily reflected the near absence of Low Participation Counties. In these ten states, only 6 of a possible 477 counties (1 percent), had low levels of WIC support.

The top ten states in WIC participation also included New Hampshire, Maryland, South Carolina, Ohio, North Carolina and Wyoming. Of these six states, Wyoming had the highest percentage of counties with high levels of WIC participation, although it also had a high percentage of Low Participation Counties.

Seven of Ten Lowest Scoring States in the West

The significant gap between the most and least successful states in the level of WIC participation substantially reflects consistently low scores among western states. The ten states with the lowest scores included six western states: Hawaii, Montana, New Mexico, Arizona, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington. In each of these states, WIC Low Participation Counties comprised at least 30 percent of all counties and the percentage of High Participation Counties was never higher than

TABLE V-4
1984 WIC Participation Scores and Rank by State

| State | Score | Rank <u>1/</u> | State | Score | Rank <u>1/</u> |
|----------------|-------|----------------|---------------|-------|----------------|
| Vermont | 100 | 1 | Virginia | 3 | 26 |
| Wisconsin | 46 | 2 | West Virginia | 2 | 27 |
| Michigan | 43 | 3 | Alaska | 0 | 28 |
| Nevada | 41 | 4 | Dist. of Col. | 0 | 28 |
| New Hampshire | 40 | 5 | Oklahoma | -4 | 30 |
| Maryland | 38 | 6 | Maine | -6 | 31 |
| South Carolina | 37 | 7 | Florida | -10 | 32 |
| Ohio | 31 | 8 | Colorado | -13 | 33 |
| North Carolina | 31 | 8 | Utah | -14 | 34 |
| Wyoming | 30 | 10 | Massachusetts | -14 | 34 |
| Mississippi | 29 | 11 | Indiana | -15 | 36 |
| Missouri | 26 | 12 | California | -19 | 37 |
| Georgia | 26 | 12 | New Jersey | -20 | 38 |
| Connecticut | 25 | 14 | Arkansas | -23 | 39 |
| Illinois | 20 | 15 | Washington | -28 | 40 |
| Rhode Island | 20 | 15 | South Dakota | -28 | 40 |
| North Dakota | 19 | 17 | Oregon | -31 | 42 |
| Alabama | 12 | 18 | Delaware | -33 | 43 |
| Tennessee | 12 | 18 | Idaho | -34 | 44 |
| Minnesota | 11 | 20 | Nebraska | -35 | 45 |
| New York | 10 | 21 | Arizona | -36 | 46 |
| Iowa | 10 | 21 | New Mexico | -41 | 47 |
| Kentucky | 9 | 23 | Montana | -42 | 48 |
| Louisiana | 9 | 23 | Kansas | -47 | 49 |
| Pennsylvania | 4 | 25 | Texas | -51 | 50 |
| | | | Hawaii | -75 | 51 |

1/ States with equal scores received equal ranks.

8 percent. In Montana, 17 of 27 Low Participation Counties provided WIC benefits to no children.

Other states with very low WIC participation scores in 1984 included Texas, Kansas, Nebraska, and Delaware.^{1/} These states contained a significant number of Low Participation Counties where no children received WIC benefits.

Texas had the second lowest rating of all states in the Nation. Over 60 percent of Texas counties were WIC Low Participation Counties. Of these, 87 percent (135 of 155) were counties where no children received WIC benefits. In fact, no children were served in over half of all Texas counties. The number of Texas counties in which no children were served by the program represented 41 percent of all such counties in the entire Nation.

In nearly all of the Low Participation Counties in Kansas (57 of 63), no children received WIC benefits. Nebraska's very low rating reflected a near majority of Low Participation Counties, 58 percent of which served no children.

ONLY ONE IN SEVEN OF THE POOREST COUNTIES HAD STRONG
WIC PROGRAMS; BENEFITS LACKING OR LOW IN 17 PERCENT

This section describes the relationship between child poverty and children's participation in WIC at the county level. Those counties that were both Child Poverty Counties -- counties with child poverty rates above 25 percent according to the 1980 Census -- and WIC High Participation Counties are described first, followed by counties that were both Child Poverty Counties and WIC Low Participation Counties.

^{1/} In 1986, substantial numbers of new WIC programs had been instituted in Texas, Kansas and several other states. These are noted in Table H-2, Appendix H.

High Participation in Fewer Than 100 Poor Counties

Like the AFDC and Head Start programs, the number of counties with high levels of child poverty that also had high percentages of children receiving benefits was exceedingly low.

Only 95, or 15 percent, of all Child Poverty Counties were also WIC High Participation Counties in 1984 (Table H-3, Appendix H). As in Head Start and AFDC, the poorest counties are not those where service levels were greatest.

Child Poverty/WIC High Participation Counties were found in 20 states, the vast majority in the South. Fully 82 of the 95 Child Poverty/WIC High Participation Counties were in southern states, led by Georgia, which had 17, and Mississippi, which had 16.

Yet even in these two cases, the percentage of all Child Poverty Counties in the state that were High Participation Counties was quite low. The 17 Georgia Child Poverty/WIC High Participation Counties represented only 23 percent of all of Georgia's poorest counties, and the 16 Child Poverty/WIC High Participation Counties in Mississippi represented only 28 percent of the counties in that state where poverty among children was most concentrated.

Inadequate Support in Over 15 Percent of Poorest Counties

In 1984, 103 counties with extreme concentrations of poverty, 17 percent, also had low WIC participation (Table H-4, Appendix H).

In 40 of these counties, 6 percent of the poorest counties, no children participated in the program.

Twenty states had at least one Child Poverty/WIC Low Participation County. Highest of all states was Texas, which had 32 Child Poverty/WIC Low Participation Counties. In 25 of these counties, no children received WIC benefits, which means that in one-third of the 78 poorest counties in Texas, no children received nutritional benefits through WIC.

While Texas had the greatest number of Child Poverty/WIC Low Participation Counties, the percentage of such counties was higher in other states. In Montana, all eight Child Poverty Counties were WIC Low Participation Counties, and four of these counties provided no benefits.

Six of ten Nebraska Child Poverty Counties were WIC Low Participation Counties, while 21 of 36, 58 percent, of all the poorest counties in South Dakota had an inadequate WIC program.

APPENDIX A
HOW THE DATA WERE OBTAINED

This chapter describes the sources of data and data gathering procedures employed in this study.

OBTAINING CHILD POVERTY DATA

Apart from national and regional analyses, county-level child poverty statistics are the primary basis for estimating low-income children's program participation throughout this study. This is accomplished by comparing the number of children at or below the poverty line in a given county to the number of impoverished children receiving AFDC, Head Start or WIC benefits in that county.

This section describes the source of county-level child poverty statistics, as well as national and regional poverty data.

Appendix B also provides a detailed description of how county-level statistics were used to estimate children's program participation in both 1979 and 1984.

1979 Child Poverty Data

Data on the number and percentage of children in poverty in each U.S. county were obtained from the 1980 Decennial Census. These are the most recent county-level poverty statistics available. (1980 Decennial Census poverty statistics actually reflect children's and families' income and poverty status in 1979.) "Children in poverty" refers to related children under 18 years of age in families with incomes at or below the poverty threshold.

National and regional poverty data for 1979 were collected from the U.S. Bureau of the Census' 1980 Current Population Survey (CPS).

1984 Poverty Data

National and regional poverty data for 1984 were obtained from the U.S. Census Bureau's 1985 CPS. Neither county nor state-level poverty data for 1984 were available.

OBTAINING AFDC PARTICIPATION DATA

1979 AFDC Data

Data on the number of children in households receiving AFDC benefits during February, 1979, were obtained from "Public Assistance Recipients and Cash Payments by State and County - February 1979" published by the Office of Research and Statistics of the Social Security Administration, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

AFDC participation data were available for all counties except a small number of counties in which the program was administered in an adjacent county. These counties were in Minnesota (Murray and Lyon Counties, administered in Lincoln County; Fairbault and Watonwan Counties, administered in Martin County); New York (Bronx, Kings, Queens, and Richmond Counties, administered in New York County); and Virginia (Bedford City, administered in Bedford County; Fairfax City, administered in Fairfax County; Poquoson County, administered in York County; Salem County, administered in Roanoke County; and South Boston County, administered in Halifax County).

1984 AFDC Data

Unlike 1979 data, 1984 county-level AFDC participation statistics for the Nation were not available directly from federal government

publications. Beginning in 1981, the Office of Management and Budget directed the Social Security Administration to collect data on children's participation in AFDC for only those counties that are part of a Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA). Data on counties not within a SMSA are no longer collected.

Consequently, the Select Committee collected county-level AFDC participation data directly from state officials. Each state was asked to provide data on the number of children in families receiving regular AFDC benefits, and the number of children in families receiving AFDC benefits because the primary earner was unemployed (AFDC - UP), during March, 1984. These data were later combined to yield a single count of all children receiving AFDC benefits in each county.

The procedure for collecting the data was as follows: State AFDC program officials were informed by telephone of the nature of the study and the data on children's participation that was required. A letter formally requesting the data was then sent either to the AFDC program administrator or the appropriate state official designated by the administrator.^{1/}

All 50 states and the District of Columbia provided participation data.

It should be noted, however, that Connecticut, Montana, and Nevada did not have county-level participation data for March, 1984. For these three states, data for February, 1984, were substituted. (February is the month for which AFDC data are collected for the federal government.) In each case, state officials assured the Committee that caseloads during February did not vary substantially from March caseloads.

^{1/} A copy of the letter requesting AFDC data is included in Appendix J.

As in 1979, AFDC participation data were not available for several counties because the program is administered by a neighboring county. The counties where this occurred in 1984 are the same as in 1979.

As noted earlier, in both 1979 and 1984, AFDC monthly income eligibility limits (payment standards) were below the official poverty level in every state. Although it infrequently occurs, some children receiving AFDC may live in non-poor families. For example, children are eligible for benefits where the total income of all family members is above the poverty level, but the income of those included in the AFDC "filing unit" (the child and his or her parents or legal guardians) is below both the AFDC payment standard and the poverty line. This might occur when a child over 18 years old with some income continues to reside in the home. Also, in states with the highest payment levels, the amount of the AFDC benefit, in combination with allowable earnings after all deductions and disregards, could push some AFDC families above the poverty level.

However, the number of non-poor children receiving AFDC benefits is very small. Inclusion of these few non-poor children does not appreciably inflate the percentages of low-income children served by AFDC.

OBTAINING HEAD START PARTICIPATION DATA

1979 Head Start Data

Data on the number of children (ages 3 - 5) enrolled in Head Start for school year 1978-1979 were obtained from Head Start Funding Guidance records of the Administration for Children, Youth, and Families (ACYF) within the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

The data reflect the number of children in regular Head Start programs, as well as the number of Native Americans and migrant children served by the program. Not included are children in Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands, and other U.S. Territories, or children in programs that only operated during the summer.

Head Start is required to provide 10 percent of its slots for handicapped children, subject to the same income restrictions as non-handicapped children. These children are included in the Head Start participation data used in this study.

In addition, up to 10 percent of a Head Start grantee's service population may be from non-poor families. These non-poor children are included in the participation data as well. However, at no time will the percentage of non-poor Head Start children exceed 10 percent.

Inclusion of non-poor children in this study does not appreciably inflate the estimated percentages of low-income children served by Head Start.

1984 Head Start Data

National Head Start enrollment data for school year 1983-1984 were also collected from ACYF Funding Guidance records. County-level Head Start data were obtained from ACYF as well. However, these data are drawn from a special survey conducted in preparation for a program expansion which occurred in 1985. (Counties where no Head Start program existed in 1984, but where one was begun in 1985, are noted in Table H-2, Appendix H.)

As in 1979, the data reflect as many as 10 percent handicapped and 10 percent non-poor children. Children in U.S. Territories are excluded.

It should be noted that data pertaining to the number of Head Start enrollees during the 1978-1979 school year are noted in the Head Start Funding Guidance records under fiscal year 1978 (October 1, 1977 - September 30, 1978) and those children enrolled in the 1983-84 school year are noted under fiscal year 1983 (October 1, 1982 - September 30, 1983). In each case, the data reflect the number of children enrolled in the first month of the school year, September, which is the last month of the fiscal year. So, for example, the 395,000 children that were enrolled in Head Start from September, 1983, to September, 1984 are listed under fiscal year 1983 in ACYF records.

OBTAINING WIC PARTICIPATION DATA

1979 WIC Data

State-level data on the average number of children receiving WIC benefits monthly in fiscal year 1979 were obtained from the U.S. Department of Agriculture Food and Nutrition Service. Specifically, the data reflect the average monthly number of infants (under one year) and children (under five years) receiving WIC benefits in FY 1979.

1984 WIC Data

Data on the number of infants and children receiving WIC benefits in each U.S. county in 1984 were obtained directly from state WIC officials using the same procedures employed to obtain 1984 AFDC data (see p. 78).

More so than AFDC and Head Start data, county-level WIC participation figures must be considered estimates of the number of children served. This is due primarily to the fact that local WIC agencies often serve families in more than one county. Participation data are normally recorded at the agency level; therefore, exact counts of the

number of individuals served within a county are often impossible. For those agencies serving several counties, state WIC officials provided the Committee estimates of the number of recipients served in each county.

A similar problem arose in the case of WIC agencies serving Indian reservations which extended into several counties. Again, state officials estimated the numbers served in each county.

Adjustments To 1984 WIC Data

Infants and children who live in families with incomes up to 185 percent of official poverty thresholds, and who are diagnosed as being nutritionally at risk, are eligible for WIC benefits. States may set income criteria that are lower than 185 percent of poverty, but not less than 100 percent of the poverty line. The most common state eligibility standard is the federally allowed maximum of 185 percent, although 14 states had lower limits in fiscal year 1985 (Maine, Virginia, West Virginia, Alabama, Florida, Tennessee, Arkansas, Louisiana, Iowa, Missouri, South Dakota, Alaska, Arizona, and California). (See Appendix C for a discussion of how the WIC program operates.)

Consequently, some of the children enumerated in the WIC participation data submitted to the Select Committee would be expected to live in non-poor families. Since the study focuses on children served by WIC who live in families with income at or below the poverty level, it was necessary to adjust WIC participation figures to reflect the best estimate of the number of children receiving WIC benefits who were actually below the poverty line.

National and regional data on the monthly income of families in which children received WIC benefits in March and April, 1984, were

available from the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP). Because the April data were derived from a larger sample, these data were used to estimate the percentage of WIC children who lived in families with incomes below the poverty line.

The following procedure was used: For households of different size, a monthly-income poverty standard was created by dividing the annual poverty income threshold by 12. Children in families with monthly incomes below this figure were considered poor for the purposes of this analysis.

Because of the sample size used in the SIPP study, estimates of the percentage of children receiving WIC who were in poor families could only be computed for the Nation and the four regions. The percentage of WIC children who were poor in each region was applied to counties within the region, thereby adjusting downward the numbers of children receiving WIC. Of all WIC children (infants and children up to age 5) in the Northeast, 56.1 percent were poor; in the South, 65 percent; in the Midwest, 66.5 percent; and in the West, 56 percent.

All other poverty data in this report are official estimates based on families' annual income. To be consistent, it would have been preferable to determine the percentage of children receiving WIC who are actually poor based on the annual income of families in the program, which would very likely be lower than those reported in Chapter V. However, these data were not available from the SIPP study.

As a result, monthly family income was used instead. The use of monthly family income data to determine the percentage of children receiving WIC who are poor produces different estimates than would have been produced if annual income data had been used.

Family income can vary substantially from month to month. For families with annual incomes that are below the poverty line, monthly variations may occasionally cause their income to climb above the poverty threshold during a month, while the reverse will occur for families with an annual income above the poverty level. Because more families have annual incomes in the range immediately above the poverty line than in the range just below, such monthly fluctuations in income might be expected to cause monthly poverty rates to exceed annual poverty rates. The number of families that are not poor on an annual basis but who experience an income decrease that drops them below the poverty line for a given month will likely be greater than the number of families that are poor for the year but whose incomes rise above the poverty line for that month. The number of poor families in any given month would thus be expected to exceed the number of families that are poor over a full year, and monthly poverty rates would be greater than annual poverty rates.

Moreover, the degree to which monthly and annual poverty levels differ will vary depending on the month chosen for comparison. That is, for many families, income is seasonal, often with predictable month-to-month fluctuations. These seasonal changes would add to the probability that monthly income for many families would not truly indicate their annual poverty status.

As a result, the percentages estimated here of children receiving WIC who are actually poor, which are based on monthly income data, would tend to be higher than estimates based on annual income data.

Applying regional data on the percentage of children receiving WIC who are poor to county participation data is the best available method to adjust WIC participation data. The term "synthetic estimates" was

used by the U.S. National Center for Health Statistics to describe this method of estimation.^{1/} It is important to note that in using this method there will likely be instances where the actual percentage of WIC children who were poor in a given county differs from the regional average. Where this is true, estimates of the percentage of poor children receiving WIC benefits reported here would tend to over- or underestimate the true rate of participation to some degree. Again, these errors are unavoidable given existing data.

Finally, in the 14 states where the WIC eligibility limit is less than 185 percent of the poverty threshold, the percentage of children receiving benefits who are poor may be somewhat higher than it is in states with the maximum income limit. As a result, adjusting total counts of children receiving benefits to reflect the regional proportion of poor children receiving benefits may underestimate the actual percentage of recipients who are poor in these states.

If this were a significant source of bias in the data, we would expect these states to cluster at the bottom in terms of WIC participation. However, this was not found -- participation levels among these states varied widely.

^{1/} See "Synthetic State Estimates of Disability," published in 1968 by the National Center for Health Statistics, PHS Publication No. 1759.

APPENDIX B
METHODS OF ANALYSIS

This chapter describes the methods used to determine national and regional participation levels for AFDC, Head Start and WIC in 1984 and 1979 and the procedures developed to compare levels of participation among counties and states. Methodological issues that may affect the interpretation of the study's findings are also discussed.

ESTIMATING LOW-INCOME CHILDREN'S PROGRAM PARTICIPATION
AT THE NATIONAL AND REGIONAL LEVEL

For 1984 and 1979, national estimates of the percentage of low-income children receiving Head Start and WIC benefits, and national and regional estimates of the percentage of low-income children receiving AFDC benefits, were determined by comparing the number of children receiving benefits during a representative month (or in the case of Head Start, during the 1978-79 and 1983-84 school years), to the total number of age-eligible, poor children in 1979 and 1984 as estimated in the 1980 and 1985 Current Population Surveys.

ESTIMATING PROGRAM PARTICIPATION
AT THE COUNTY LEVEL

Problems in Computing County Rates

For 1979, county-level participation rates for AFDC were determined by comparing the number of children receiving benefits to the number of low-income children. However, county participation rates for Head Start and WIC could not be determined because program participation data for that year were unavailable.

For 1984, county-level participation data were available for AFDC, WIC, and Head Start. However, county-level poverty statistics were

unavailable, making it impossible to calculate participation rates for that year. As noted earlier, county poverty statistics are only available from the 1980 Decennial Census.

An alternative method for estimating county-level participation was developed. For each county, the number of children receiving AFDC, WIC or Head Start services in 1984 was compared to the number of poor children of the appropriate ages in the county in 1979. The percentages derived from these comparisons were used to rank all counties from highest to lowest in terms of the degree to which low-income children were served.

These rankings were divided into fifths, each fifth containing approximately 620 counties. Counties in the highest fifth for a particular program were designated as "High Participation Counties" for that program, while counties in the lowest fifth were designated as "Low Participation Counties." These High and Low Participation Counties formed the basis for all subsequent county-level analyses.

We chose to make use of quintiles as a way of assessing participation at the county level as opposed to the actual percentages derived by comparing 1979 poverty data to 1984 participation data because of the large increase in poverty among children between 1979 and 1984. 1979 poverty data do not reflect this increase. Consequently, a comparison of these data to 1984 participation data would tend to inflate the actual level of program participation among low-income children.

The method that was employed is based on an assumption that if 1984 poverty statistics were available and compared to 1984 participation data, the majority of the High and Low Participation Counties identified would be the same as those identified in this analysis,

using 1979 poverty data. Differences in the rate of increase in poverty among counties, or the fact that poverty in some counties may actually have decreased, might create some discrepancies. However, it is unlikely that these differences would substantially alter the composition of these quintiles.

Given existing data, no attempt is made to assess the actual level of program participation in any county (that is, a specific participation rate), only the relative levels of service between counties, cast in broad terms. While this does not preclude the potential for error in classifying some counties, this method represents the soundest approach available for characterizing how well low-income children are served in this Nation at the county level.

DEVELOPMENT OF STATE PROGRAM PARTICIPATION SCALES
BASED ON COUNTY PARTICIPATION INDICES

As with county participation rates, the rate at which low-income children received AFDC, Head Start, and WIC benefits by state could not be determined directly because of the lack of up-to-date state-level poverty data.

In lieu of a direct measure, state "Participation Scales" were developed to characterize differences among states in the relative level of AFDC, Head Start, and WIC support provided to low-income children in 1984, and, in the case of AFDC, to contrast the level of support afforded poor children in 1979 and 1984.

Each state's score provides an indication of how well low-income children were served in the state, and a way of ranking each state's level of support vis-a-vis all other states.

For each program, the Participation Scale was derived by subtracting the percentage of Low Participation Counties in a state from the percentage of High Participation Counties in that state. This yields a single measure of participation for each state. Thus, depending on the percentage of High and Low Participation Counties in the state, a state's score could range from -100 to 100.

For example, in the state of Alabama, 12 of 67 (18 percent) of all counties were Head Start High Participation Counties. Twenty-one Alabama counties, 31 percent, were Head Start Low Participation Counties. Alabama's Head Start Participation Score was equal to 18 minus 31, or -13.

Accuracy of the Method

The accuracy of state Participation Scales in depicting state-level program participation can be tested by comparing states' rank on the 1979 county-based AFDC Participation Scale, described above, to their rank on a scale using the average monthly percentages of poor children served by each state in that year. (1979 is the only year for which this comparison can be done because of the limitations on program participation and poverty data described earlier.)

A rank order correlation of states' rank on the 1979 AFDC Participation Scale and their rank based directly on the percentages served showed an exceptionally strong, positive relationship between the two variables. The strength of the relationship was well beyond all conventional criteria of statistical significance (Spearman's Rho = .531, $P < .001$).

What the test shows is that a state's rank on the 1979 AFDC Participation Scale is generally very similar to its rank on a measure

of participation which takes account of the actual number of children served in a state. For example, 13 of the top 15 states on the AFDC Participation Scale were also in the top 15 on the direct measure of state AFDC participation. Similarly, 13 of the lowest 15 states on the AFDC Participation Scale were in the bottom 15 on the direct measure.

The results of this test strongly suggest that the state Participation Scales, based on the percentages of High and Low Participation Counties in each state, are reliable measures of program participation at the state level.

ISSUES RELATED TO THE DETERMINATION OF PROGRAM PARTICIPATION
RATES FOR LOW-INCOME CHILDREN

Disparity Between Monthly and Annual Data

As noted earlier, comparing the number of children who are poor on an annual basis to the number of children receiving benefits during one month differs from a comparison of the number of children in families with income below poverty during that month to the number of participating children. Generally, one would expect there to be more "monthly poor" than "annually poor." (Appendix A, p. 84)

This, for the most part, explains why AFDC participation rates contained in this report for some states and counties are reported as being more than 100 percent. Percentages above 100 percent reflect the differences in reporting periods between AFDC program participation data, reported monthly, and poverty figures, reported annually. In these states and counties, there were more children with incomes low enough to receive AFDC benefits during that month than there were children in families with income below the poverty level during the entire year.

Participation rates above 100 percent also reflect the slight possibility that some children receiving AFDC are in families above the poverty line (Appendix A, p. 80).

Neither monthly nor annual poverty rates are necessarily superior indicators of true need. It can be argued that monthly poverty rates are more closely aligned to AFDC and WIC eligibility criteria and would, therefore, serve as better indicators of need. However, monthly poverty rates cannot take into account a family's ability to defer expenditures during months with low income until incomes are higher in the future. The need to take this into consideration is implicit in the AFDC assets test which families must pass in addition to the income test. Thus annual poverty rates may, in fact, more truly indicate need. On the other hand, annual poverty rates are less sensitive to the immediate needs of families which cannot be postponed.

APPENDIX C

HOW THE PROGRAMS OPERATE 1/AID TO FAMILIES WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN (AFDC)Program Description

Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) was established and permanently authorized by Title IV-A of the Social Security Act of 1935 as a cash grant program to enable states to aid needy children without fathers. Renamed Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), the program provides cash payments to needy children and their mothers or other caretaker relatives.

States determine standards of financial need and maximum benefit levels, and administer the program or supervise its administration; Federal law governs the treatment of recipients' earnings.

All states, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands offer AFDC to needy children without able-bodied parents at home, and 26 jurisdictions offer Federal cash supplements also to children in two-parent families who are needy because of the unemployment of one of their parents (Aid to Families with Dependent Children of Unemployed Parents [AFDC-UP]).

Financing and Administration

The Federal government pays at least 50 percent of each state's benefit payments and more than 70 percent in 11 States. The federal

1/ This section relies heavily on Federal Programs Affecting Children, published by the House Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families, January, 1984, and Background Material And Data On Programs Within the Jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means, published by the Committee on Ways and Means, U.S. House of Representatives, March, 1986.

share for AFDC varies among states, ranging from 50 percent to 78 percent, and it is inversely related to state per capita income. Under matching formulas in the law, about 55 percent of each AFDC benefit dollar is paid by the Federal government and 45 percent is paid by the states, some of which require local governments to share costs. At the start of FY 1984, ten states required their localities to pay some portion of the benefit costs.

The Federal government pays 50 percent of administrative costs in all states. The program is administered on the federal level by the Office of Family Assistance, Social Security Administration, in the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, and by state and county income assistance offices on the state and local level.

Eligibility

Children are eligible who have been deprived of parental support or care because a parent is absent from home continuously (84.2 percent of the children); are incapacitated (3.4 percent); deceased (1.8 percent); or unemployed (8.7 percent). Of the group of absent parents (nearly always the father), 19.5 percent were divorced or legally separated, 19 percent were not legally separated, 44.3 percent were not married, and 3.1 percent were absent for other unknown reasons.^{1/}

Eligibility for AFDC ends on a child's 18th birthday, or at state option upon a child's 19th birthday if the child is a full-time student in a secondary or technical school and may reasonably be expected to complete the program before he or she reaches age 19.

^{1/} AFDC Quality Control Study for Fiscal Year 1983, Office of Family Assistance, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Eligibility for AFDC on the basis of a parent's unemployment is limited to those families in which the principal wage earner is employed less than 100 hours per month. AFDC and AFDC-UP eligibility are determined monthly.

Current Benefit and Participation Levels

Each state establishes a "need standard" (the income the state decides is essential for basic consumption items) and a "payment standard" (100 percent or less of the need level). Benefits are determined monthly and generally computed by subtracting countable income from the state's payment standard. (See Table III-11, p. 51, for state payment standards as of July 1985.)

To receive AFDC payments, a family must pass two income tests: first, a gross income test, and second, a counted ("net") income test. The gross income test is currently 185 percent of the state's need standard for the relevant family size. To be eligible for actual payment, however, the family's counted income also must be below the state's payment standard. Maximum AFDC payments vary sharply from state to state (see Table III-9, p. 44, for maximum payments as of January, 1986.) Average benefits per average AFDC family (2.9 persons) were \$338 per month in fiscal year 1985, compared to \$321 a year earlier.

In 1985, 10.8 million individuals participated in the AFDC program, of whom 7.2 million, or 66 percent, were children. These individuals comprised 3.7 million families, of which 273,000 or 7 percent were two-parent families aided because of the unemployment of a parent.

AFDC for Unemployed Parents (AFDC-UP)

The number of AFDC-UP state programs has varied in recent years. There were 29 in September, 1979, 23 in December, 1982, and 26 in January, 1986. During the 1970's, the AFDC-UP program served a monthly average of 120,000 families. In recent years, the monthly average number of AFDC-UP families has risen: fiscal year 1981, 209,000 families; fiscal year 1982, 232,000; fiscal year 1983, 272,000; and fiscal year 1984, 288,000. In fiscal year 1985, the number dropped to 273,000. In fiscal year 1985, AFDC-UP families (averaging 4.4 persons) received payments averaging \$518 per family, compared to \$479 a year earlier.

OBRA Eligibility Limits and Recent Amendments

The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 (OBRA, P.L. 97-35) changed AFDC rules significantly. The new rules primarily affected families with earnings and children living with their stepparents. For most such families, benefits were terminated or reduced. In 1984, Congress again revised the AFDC program, restoring eligibility to some of the families affected by the 1981 changes.

As noted in Chapter III, of the 22 provisions in OBRA which affected the AFDC program, the U.S. Government Accounting Office (GAO) identified six that had the most effect on program participation:

- A limitation on gross income to 150 percent of the state "need standard" (the amount of income determined by the state as necessary to meet a minimal standard of living);
- The imposition of a 4-month limit on eligibility for an existing provision in which the first \$30 of earned income and one-third of the remainder were disregarded in the calculation of AFDC benefits;
- The placement of a \$75 ceiling on work expense deductions for full-time employment;

- The placement of a \$160 ceiling on the child care expense deduction for each child;
- The inclusion of the income of stepparents; and
- The limitation of assets to \$1,000.

In June of 1984, Congress enacted the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984 (P.L. 98-369). This law, which took effect on October 1, 1984, includes AFDC amendments which significantly altered OBRA provisions.

1. Gross income limitation. Under prior law, eligibility for AFDC was limited to families with gross incomes at or below 150 percent of the state's standard of need. The 1984 act increased the gross income limitation to 185 percent of the state standard of need.

2. Work expense deduction. Under prior law, states were required to disregard the first \$75 of monthly earnings for full-time work expenses; a lower deduction applied to part-time workers. The 1984 Act requires states to disregard the first \$75 monthly for both full and part-time workers.

3. Continuation of \$30 disregard. Under prior law, the \$30 plus one-third of remaining earnings disregard was limited to four months. The 1984 law retains the 4-month limit on the one-third disregard but extends the \$30 disregard for an additional 8 months for a total of 12 months.

4. Work transition status. Under prior law, a family which lost AFDC eligibility due to the 4-month limit on the earnings disregard simultaneously lost categorical eligibility for Medicaid. The 1984 Act provides that families who lose AFDC because of the termination of the earnings disregard will be eligible for 9 months of Medicaid coverage. At state option, an additional 6 months of Medicaid coverage can be

provided. In addition, families who lost AFDC eligibility prior to enactment of the work transition will also be eligible for Medicaid under certain specified circumstances.

Work Requirements and Programs

Federal law requires certain able-bodied recipients, including mothers whose youngest child is at least six years old, to register for work or job training. States may require work registrants to participate in one of several work programs: Work Incentive (WIN) Programs; Community Work Experience Programs (CWEP), Work Supplementation, or Job Search.

The WIN program and WIN demonstrations

The WIN program was established in 1967 with the purpose of providing skills assessments, job training, and employment placements to help AFDC recipients become self-supporting. At the Federal level, the program is jointly administered by the Department of Labor and the Department of Health and Human Services. A dual administration is also in place at the state level, unless the state has elected to operate a WIN demonstration project. These projects, authorized by OBRA, permit states to design an alternative to WIN, administered solely by state welfare agencies. By January, 1986, 26 states were operating WIN demonstrations.

Community work experience program

Under authority granted by OBRA, states may operate community work experience programs (CWEP) if they so choose. These programs are commonly referred to as "workfare" and require adult AFDC recipients to perform some sort of community work, such as park

beautification or serving as a teacher aide, in exchange for the APDC benefit.

States may require CWEP participation by most APDC recipients who are registered for WIN. However, unlike WIN, which exempts parents with children under the age of six from the work requirement, CWEP may require parents caring for children under age six (but not under age three) to participate if child care is available.

As of January, 1986, four states had opted to implement some kind of community work experience program. Most state workfare programs are not statewide.

Work supplementation and grant diversion

OBRA also permits states to operate work supplementation programs, in which APDC may be used to subsidize a job for an APDC recipient. The Deficit Reduction Act of 1984 amended the work supplementation program requirements. Under the new law: (1) recipients may be placed in jobs offered by private as well as nonprofit employers; (2) states are permitted, but not required, to offer a \$30 plus one-third earned income disregard for up to nine months for participants; (3) federal funding is limited to the aggregate of nine months worth of unreduced welfare grants for each participant in the work supplementation program (or less if the person participates for fewer than nine months); and (4) a state is permitted to develop its own method by which APDC grants are diverted to wages and is not limited to prior law requirements.

Eleven states have requested and received waivers which permit them to operate a similar program called grant diversion, in which a

state may use the AFDC benefit as a wage subsidy to encourage employers to hire AFDC recipients.

Job search

States are also permitted to require AFDC applicants and recipients to participate in a program of employment search beginning at the time of application. After an initial 8-week search period for applicants, AFDC recipients may be required to participate in eight weeks of job search each year.

At state option the job search requirement may be limited to certain groups or classes of individuals who are required to register for WIN. Transportation and other necessary costs incurred by participants must be reimbursed. States receive 50 percent Federal matching funds for these costs.

Medicaid and Food Stamps

States must provide Medicaid to families receiving cash assistance under AFDC. When families lose AFDC eligibility, categorical Medicaid eligibility also frequently ends, except under certain circumstances (see p. 97). Most AFDC families are also eligible for and participate in the Food Stamp program. Although food stamp benefits are not counted in determining AFDC eligibility, the food stamp program does consider AFDC payments to be countable income and reduces the food stamp benefit by \$0.30 for each dollar of countable cash income.

HEAD STARTProgram Description

The Head Start program has been in operation since 1965 and is authorized through fiscal year 1986 under the Head Start Act, as amended.

Head Start provides educational, social, medical, and nutritional services in child day care settings to primarily low-income preschool children, usually between the ages of 3 and 5. The program is particularly designed to bridge the gap in early childhood development between economically disadvantaged preschool children and their more advantaged peers, so that they might begin their formal education on a more equal basis. The program stresses parent participation and involvement in both program development and operation.

In 1983, the most recent year for which data are available, there were 8,700 regular centers across the country. Head Start also funds roughly 400 migrant programs and 300 Indian programs. There are also around 35 parent-child centers, which provide services to infants 0 through age 3, and their parents and older siblings.

About 10 percent of the Head Start programs are full-day, 82 percent are half-day, and 8 percent are combinations of full- and half-day. No fees are charged families participating in the programs, although families able and willing to pay the cost of participation may do so.

Financing and Administration

The appropriation was \$1.087 billion for Head Start for fiscal year 1986. However, the actual amount of funding available to the program in FY 1986 was \$1.04 billion after sequester, pursuant to P.L. 99-177 (The Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985). In FY 1987, the appropriation was \$1.130 billion.

Funds are allocated by state, but are distributed in the form of competitive grants to local Head Start agencies. The federal share is 80 percent. Grantees may provide their 20 percent share in cash or in kind, by providing space, volunteers, or other forms of support. The Secretary of Health and Human Services is authorized to waive the matching requirement and allow a higher federal share.

The administering agency is the Administration for Children, Youth and Families, Office of Human Development, at the Department of Health and Human Services. The program is administered at the local level by Head Start agencies.

Eligibility

To be eligible for Head Start, children must live in families with an income at or below the poverty threshold. At grantee option, however, up to 10 percent of participating children may be from non-poor families. In addition, at least 10 percent of children served must be handicapped.

SPECIAL SUPPLEMENTAL FOOD PROGRAM FOR
WOMEN, INFANTS, AND CHILDREN (WIC)

Program Description

The Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants and Children (WIC) was established in 1972, amending the Child Nutrition

Act of 1966. It has been extended through fiscal year 1987 by continuing resolution.

WIC distributes federal funds to states and certain recognized Indian tribes or groups to provide supplemental foods to low-income, pregnant, postpartum, and nursing mothers, and infants and children up to age 5 who are diagnosed as being at nutritional risk. It also provides nutrition counseling and education.

Food benefits are provided monthly, and consist of specified items which vary in type and quantity according to the nutritional needs of the participant. These consist largely of high protein foods such as dairy products, cereals, fruit and vegetable juices and infant formula. Participants either receive the food from the local agency, or purchase it from a retail outfit through the use of a voucher issued by the local agency. This voucher specifies the items and quantities which may be purchased by the participant, and is the most common form of food delivery in the WIC program.

In May of 1986, program participation reached a level of 3.3 million women, infants and children, with an average monthly food cost per participant of approximately \$32.00.

Financing and Administration

In FY 1987, \$1.66 billion was appropriated for WIC.

The WIC program is administered at the federal level by the Department of Agriculture's Food and Nutrition Service. The Service makes cash grants to participating State health departments or comparable State agencies. These WIC agencies, in turn, distribute funds to participating local WIC agencies in their jurisdiction. Local agencies may

include city or county health departments, or any of a variety of public or private nonprofit health or human service organizations such as hospitals, maternal and child health groups, or community action programs.

Eligibility

Participants must show evidence of nutritional deficiency and have an income that is no higher than 185 percent of the poverty level in order to be eligible for the program. States may set income criteria that are lower than 185 percent of the poverty level; however, such criteria may not be less than 100 percent of this level. In fiscal year 1985, 14 states had income criteria less than 185 percent of the poverty level: Alabama, Alaska, Arkansas, Arizona, California, Florida, Iowa, Louisiana, Maine, Montana, Tennessee, Utah, Virginia, and West Virginia.

APPENDIX D
Child Poverty Counties

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------|
| Table D-1—Child Poverty Counties..... | Page 107 |
|---------------------------------------|-------------|

TABLE D-1
Child Poverty Counties

| | | |
|------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| ALABAMA: | ARKANSAS—Cont. | GEORGIA—Cont. |
| Barbour | Poinsett | Ben Hill |
| Bibb | Polk | Bibb |
| Bullock | Prairie | Brooks |
| Butler | Scott | Burke |
| Choctaw | Searcy | Calhoun |
| Clarke | Sharp | Camden |
| Conecuh | St. Francis | Candler |
| Coosa | Stone | Charlton |
| Crenshaw | Woodruff | Clay |
| Dallas | | Clinch |
| Escambia | COLORADO: | Coffee |
| Greene | Baca | Crisp |
| Hale | Conejos | Decatur |
| Henry | Costilla | Dodge |
| Lawrence | Dolores | Dooley |
| Lowndes | Huerfano | Dougherty |
| Macon | Las Animas | Early |
| Marengo | Otero | Echols |
| Monroe | Saguache | Emanuel |
| Montgomery | | Evans |
| Perry | DISTRICT OF | Fulton |
| Pickens | COLUMBIA: | Grady |
| Pike | Washington | Greene |
| Randolph | | Hancock |
| Russell | FLORIDA: | Irwin |
| Sumter | Calhoun | Jefferson |
| Washington | De Soto | Jenkins |
| Wilcox | Dixie | Johnson |
| | Flagler | Lanier |
| ARIZONA: | Franklin | Liberty |
| Apache | Gadsden | Lincoln |
| Navajo | Gulf | Long |
| | Hamilton | Macon |
| ARKANSAS: | Hardee | Marion |
| Arkansas | Hendry | McIntosh |
| Bradley | Highlands | Miller |
| Calhoun | Holmes | Mitchell |
| Chicot | Jackson | Montgomery |
| Columbia | Jefferson | Morgan |
| Crittenden | Levy | Peach |
| Cross | Liberty | Pierce |
| Desha | Madison | Pulaski |
| Fulton | Putnam | Quitman |
| Jackson | St. Lucie | Randolph |
| Jefferson | Sumter | Schley |
| Lafayette | Suwannee | Screven |
| Lee | Taylor | Seminole |
| Lincoln | Walton | Stewart |
| Marion | Washington | Sumter |
| Mississippi | | Talbot |
| Monroe | GEORGIA: | Taliaferro |
| Nevada | Appling | Tattnall |
| Newton | Atkinson | Taylor |
| Ouachita | Bacon | Telfair |
| Phillips | Baker | |

TABLE D-1—*Cont.*
Child Poverty Counties

| GEORGIA—Cont. | KENTUCKY—Cont. | LOUISIANA—Cont. |
|---------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Terrell | Lee | Tensas |
| Thomas | Leslie | Washington |
| Tift | Letcher | West Carroll |
| Toombs | Lewis | West Feliciana |
| Towns | Lincoln | Winn |
| Treutlen | Madison | |
| Turner | Magoffin | MAINE: |
| Union | Marion | Washington |
| Ware | Martin | |
| Warren | McCreary | MARYLAND: |
| Washington | Menifee | Baltimore City |
| Webster | Metcalfe | |
| Wheeler | Monroe | MASSACHUSETTS: |
| Wilcox | Montgomery | Suffolk |
| Worth | Morgan | |
| | Owen | MICHIGAN: |
| IDAHO: | Owsley | Lake |
| Owyhee | Perry | |
| Washington | Powell | MINNESOTA: |
| | Pulaski | Lincoln |
| ILLINOIS: | Robertson | Mahnomen |
| Alexander | Rockcastle | |
| Pulaski | Russell | MISSISSIPPI: |
| St. Clair | Washington | Adams |
| | Wayne | Amite |
| IOWA: | Whitley | Attala |
| Davis | Wolfe | Benton |
| Ringgold | | Bolivar |
| | LOUISIANA: | Calhoun |
| KENTUCKY: | Acadia | Carroll |
| Adair | Avoyelles | Choctaw |
| Bath | Bienville | Claiborne |
| Bell | Caldwell | Clay |
| Breathitt | Catahoula | Coahoma |
| Breckinridge | Claiborne | Copiah |
| Carter | Concordia | Covington |
| Casey | De Soto | Forrest |
| Christian | East Carroll | Franklin |
| Clay | East Feliciana | Greene |
| Clinton | Evangeline | Grenada |
| Cumberland | Franklin | Hinds |
| Elliott | Iberville | Holmes |
| Estill | Madison | Humphreys |
| Fleming | Morehouse | Issaquena |
| Floyd | Natchitoches | Jasper |
| Fulton | Orleans | Jefferson |
| Green | Ouachita | Jefferson Davis |
| Harlan | Pointe Coupee | Kemper |
| Hart | Red River | Lauderdale |
| Jackson | Richland | Leake |
| Johnson | Sabine | Leflore |
| Knott | St. Helena | Lincoln |
| Knox | St. Landry | Lowndes |
| Larue | Tangipahoa | Madison |
| Lawrence | | Marion |
| | | Marshall |

TABLE D-1—*Cont.*
Child Poverty Counties

| MISSISSIPPI—Cont. | MONTANA—Cont. | NORTH CAROLINA—Cont. |
|-------------------|-----------------|----------------------|
| Monroe | Prairie | Hoke |
| Montgomery | Treasure | Hyde |
| Neshoba | NEBRASKA: | Madison |
| Newton | Arthur | Martin |
| Noxubee | Banner | Nash |
| Oktibbeha | Blaine | Northampton |
| Panola | Boyd | Pender |
| Pearl River | Greeley | Perquimans |
| Perry | Hayes | Pitt |
| Pike | Logan | Robeson |
| Quitman | Morrill | Swain |
| Scott | Thurston | Tyrrell |
| Sharkey | Wheeler | Vance |
| Smith | NEVADA: | Warren |
| Sunflower | Eureka | Wilson |
| Tallahatchie | NEW JERSEY: | Yancey |
| Tate | Essex | NORTH DAKOTA: |
| Tunica | Hudson | Benson |
| Walthall | NEW MEXICO: | Billings |
| Washington | De Baca | Dunn |
| Wayne | Dona Ana | Emmons |
| Wilkinson | Guadalupe | Grant |
| Winston | Luna | Hettinger |
| Yalobusha | McKinley | Kidder |
| Yazoo | Mora | Logan |
| MISSOURI: | Rio Arriba | McIntosh |
| Butler | Roosevelt | Rolette |
| Carter | San Miguel | Sheridan |
| Douglas | Sierra | Sioux |
| Dunklin | Socorro | Slope |
| Hickory | Taos | OHIO: |
| Knox | Torrance | Adams |
| Mississippi | Union | Pike |
| New Madrid | NEW YORK: | OKLAHOMA: |
| Oregon | Bronx | Adair |
| Ozark | Kings | Atoka |
| Pemiscot | New York | Caddo |
| Reynolds | NORTH CAROLINA: | Choctaw |
| Ripley | Beaufort | Coal |
| Shannon | Bertie | Delaware |
| St. Louis City | Bladen | Greer |
| Stone | Cherokee | Harmon |
| Wayne | Chowan | Hughes |
| Worth | Columbus | Johnston |
| Wright | Duplin | Kiowa |
| MONTANA: | Edgecombe | Latimer |
| Blaine | Gates | Marshall |
| Carter | Greene | McCurtain |
| Garfield | Halifax | McIntosh |
| Glacier | Hertford | Pushmataha |
| Judith Basin | | Tillman |
| Petroleum | | |

TABLE D-1—*Cont.*
Child Poverty Counties

| | | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|---------------|
| PENNSYLVANIA: Philadelphia | SOUTH DAKOTA— Cont. | TEXAS—Cont. |
| SOUTH CAROLINA: | Roberts | Floyd |
| Allendale | Sanborn | Frio |
| Bamberg | Shannon | Gaines |
| Calhoun | Sully | Glasscock |
| Clarendon | Todd | Gonzales |
| Colleton | Tripp | Grimes |
| Darlington | Ziebach | Hale |
| Dillon | | Hall |
| Edgefield | TENNESSEE: | Hardeman |
| Fairfield | Bledsoe | Haskell |
| Florence | Campbell | Hidalgo |
| Georgetown | Claiborne | Hockley |
| Hampton | Clay | Houston |
| Jasper | Cocke | Hudspeth |
| Lee | Cumberland | Jeff Davis |
| Marion | Fayette | Karnes |
| Marlboro | Fentress | Kenedy |
| McCormick | Grundy | King |
| Orangeburg | Hancock | Kinney |
| Saluda | Hardeman | Kleberg |
| Sumter | Haywood | Knox |
| Williamsburg | Jackson | La Salle |
| | Johnson | Lamb |
| | Lake | Leon |
| SOUTH DAKOTA: | Lauderdale | Limestone |
| Aurora | Morgan | Lynn |
| Bennett | Overton | Madison |
| Bon Homme | Pickett | Marion |
| Brule | Scott | Mason |
| Buffalo | Shelby | Maverick |
| Campbell | Union | McCulloch |
| Charles Mix | | Medina |
| Clark | TEXAS: | Menard |
| Corson | Atascosa | Mills |
| Deuel | Bailey | Mitchell |
| Dewey | Bee | Motley |
| Douglas | Briscoe | Parmer |
| Edmunds | Brooks | Presidio |
| Faulk | Caldwell | Real |
| Gregory | Cameron | Red River |
| Hamlin | Castro | Reeves |
| Hand | Cochran | Robertson |
| Hanson | Collingsworth | Runnels |
| Harding | Concho | San Augustine |
| Hutchinson | Cottle | San Jacinto |
| Hyde | Crosby | San Saba |
| Jackson | Dawson | Starr |
| Kingsbury | De Witt | Swisher |
| Lyman | Dickens | Terry |
| Marshall | Dimmit | Upton |
| McPherson | Duval | Uvalde |
| Mellette | Edwards | Val Verde |
| Miner | El Paso | Webb |
| Potter | Falls | Wilbarger |

TABLE D-1—*Cont.*
Child Poverty Counties

| | | |
|-------------|----------------|----------------|
| TEXAS—Cont. | VIRGINIA—Cont. | WEST VIRGINIA: |
| Willacy | Greensville | Braxton |
| Zapata | Lee | Calhoun |
| Zavala | Norfolk | Clay |
| UTAH: | Northampton | Doddridge |
| San Juan | Petersburg | Lincoln |
| VIRGINIA: | Portsmouth | McDowell |
| Accomack | Prince Edward | Mingo |
| Brunswick | Richmond City | Pendleton |
| Charlotte | Southampton | Summers |
| Cumberland | Surry | Webster |
| Franklin | Sussex | |
| | Westmoreland | |

APPENDIX E

Tables Relating to Participation Across All Programs

| | Page |
|--|------|
| Table E-1—Counties With High Participation In AFDC, Head Start and WIC | 115 |
| Table E-2—Counties With High Participation In Head Start and WIC | 116 |
| Table E-3—Counties With High Participation In AFDC and Head Start | 118 |
| Table E-4—Counties With High Participation In AFDC and WIC | 119 |
| Table E-5—Counties With Low Participation In AFDC, Head Start and WIC | 121 |
| Table E-6—Counties With Low Participation In AFDC and Head Start | 123 |
| Table E-7—Counties With Low Participation In Head Start and WIC | 126 |
| Table E-8—Counties With Low Participation In AFDC and WIC | 129 |
| Table E-9—Child Poverty Counties With High Participation In AFDC, Head Start and WIC | 131 |
| Table E-10—Child Poverty Counties With High Participation In Head Start and WIC | 132 |
| Table E-11—Child Poverty Counties With High Participation In AFDC and Head Start | 133 |
| Table E-12—Child Poverty Counties With High Participation In AFDC and WIC | 134 |
| Table E-13—Child Poverty Counties With Low Participation In AFDC, Head Start and WIC | 135 |
| Table E-14—Child Poverty Counties With Low Participation In AFDC and WIC | 136 |
| Table E-15—Child Poverty Counties With Low Participation In AFDC and Head Start | 137 |
| Table E-16—Child Poverty Counties With Low Participation In Head Start and WIC | 138 |

TABLE E-1
Counties With High Participation In AFDC, Head Start and WIC

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| CALIFORNIA: Alpine | MICHIGAN—Cont. Mackinac Menominee Ontonagon Osceola Oscoda Roscommon Schoolcraft | OHIO: Gallia Guernsey Jackson Mercer Monroe Morrow Noble Pike Preble Washington |
| COLORADO: Bent Crowley Fremont | MINNESOTA: Cass Itasca Koochiching Lake Mille Lacs Polk St. Louis Wright | PENNSYLVANIA: Cameron |
| ILLINOIS: Alexander Cass Massac Perry | | SOUTH CAROLINA: Newberry Union |
| KANSAS: Cherokee Crawford Shawnee | MISSISSIPPI: Claiborne | VIRGINIA: Fredericksburg |
| KENTUCKY: McCracken | MISSOURI: Stoddard Washington | WEST VIRGINIA: Wirt |
| MARYLAND: Charles | MONTANA: Silver Bow | WISCONSIN: Ashland Bayfield Florence Forest Jackson Menominee Racine Sawyer Vilas Waushara |
| MICHIGAN: Alger Alpena Benzie Chippewa Crawford Dickinson Gogebic Houghton Huron Iron Keweenaw Lake Luce | NEBRASKA: Adams Hall | WYOMING: Laramie |
| | NORTH CAROLINA: Scotland | |
| | NORTH DAKOTA: Rolette | |

TABLE E-2
Counties With High Participation In Head Start and WIC

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| ALABAMA: Colbert | KENTUCKY—Cont. Lee Martin McCracken Robertson Trigg Wolfe | MISSISSIPPI: Benton Chickasaw Claiborne Clay Franklin Greene Grenada Itawamba Jasper Jefferson Lafayette Lawrence Leake Lee Montgomery Newton Noxubee Perry Prentiss Tishomingo Warren Webster Winston Yalobusha |
| CALIFORNIA: Alpine | LOUISIANA: St. Helena St. James | |
| COLORADO: Bent Crowley Fremont Otero Saguache | MARYLAND: Calvert Charles Howard Kent Montgomery | MISSOURI: Bollinger Carter Dade Holt Howard Lewis Madison Phelps Reynolds Stoddard Washington Wright |
| FLORIDA: Okeechobee | MICHIGAN: Alder Alpena Benzie Chippewa Crawford Dickinson Gogebic Houghton Huron Iron Keweenaw Lake Luce Mackinac Menominee Ontonagon Osceola Oscoda Roscommon Schoolcraft | MONTANA: Silver Bow |
| GEORGIA: Banks Butts Dawson Hall Jackson Jeff Davis Morgan Pickens Schley Stephens Stewart White Whitfield | MINNESOTA: Big Stone Cass Cook Grant Itasca Koochiching Lake Mille Lacs Polk St. Louis Wright | NEBRASKA: Adams Dakota Dawes Hall |
| ILLINOIS: Alexander Cass Massac Monroe Perry Wabash | | NEVADA: Douglas Humboldt |
| INDIANA: Ohio | | NEW MEXICO: Union |
| IOWA: Decatur Monona | | |
| KANSAS: Allen Cherokee Crawford Neosho Shawnee | | |
| KENTUCKY: Ballard Calloway Fleming Grant | | |

TABLE E-2—*Cont.*
 Counties With High Participation In Head Start and WIC

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| NEW YORK: Schoharie | OKLAHOMA—Cont. Nowata Tillman | TEXAS—Cont. Tom Green Willacy Zapata Zavala |
| NORTH CAROLINA: Chatham Dare Jackson Jones Macon Madison Scotland Swain Yadkin | PENNSYLVANIA: Cameron | VERMONT: Addison Caledonia Essex |
| NORTH DAKOTA: McHenry Rolette | SOUTH CAROLINA: Abbeville Cherokee Chester Clarendon Fairfield Laurens McCormick Newberry Union | VIRGINIA: Botetourt Craig Fredericksburg |
| OHIO: Gallia Guernsey Jackson Mercer Monroe Morrow Noble Pike Preble Putnam Washington | SOUTH DAKOTA: Hughes Lyman | WEST VIRGINIA: Wirt |
| OKLAHOMA: Atoka Beckham Haskell Logan Love Murray | TENNESSEE: Benton Chester Jackson Meigs Smith Trousdale Unicoi | WISCONSIN: Ashland Bayfield Florence Forest Jackson Menominee Price Racine Sawyer Vilas Waushara |
| | TEXAS: Bailey Bee Dimmit Jim Hogg Mills | WYOMING: Goshen Hot Springs Laramie Platte Washakie |

TABLE E-3
Counties With High Participation In AFDC and Head Start

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| CALIFORNIA: Alpine Imperial Lake Madera Napa | MICHIGAN—Cont. Iron Jackson Keweenaw Lake Luce Mackinac Menominee Montmorency Newaygo Ontonagon Osceola Oscoda Roscommon Schoolcraft | OHIO—Cont. Lucas Mercer Monroe Morrow Noble Ottawa Pike Preble Scioto Warren Washington |
| COLORADO: Alamosa Bent Crowley Fremont | | PENNSYLVANIA: Cameron |
| ILLINOIS: Alexander Cass Coles Massac Perry Pulaski | MINNESOTA: Beltrami Cass Itasca Koochiching Lake Mille Lacs Polk St. Louis Wright | SOUTH CAROLINA: Newberry Union |
| INDIANA: Floyd St. Joseph | | UTAH: Carbon |
| IOWA: Boone Clay | | VIRGINIA: Fredericksburg |
| KANSAS: Cherokee Crawford Labette Shawnee | MISSISSIPPI: Claiborne | WASHINGTON: Asotin Clallam Pend Oreille |
| KENTUCKY: McCracken | MISSOURI: Dunklin Mississippi Scott Stoddard Washington | WEST VIRGINIA: McDowell Mingo Taylor Wirt |
| MAINE: Franklin | MONTANA: Silver Bow | WISCONSIN: Ashland Bayfield Douglas Florence Forest Iron Jackson Manitowoc Menominee Racine Sauk Sawyer Vilas Washburn Waushara Wood |
| MARYLAND: Charles Queen Anne's Somerset | NEBRASKA: Adams Hall Thurston | |
| MICHIGAN: Alger Alpena Baraga Benzie Chippewa Crawford Dickinson Gladwin Gogebic Houghton Huron | NORTH CAROLINA: Scotland | |
| | NORTH DAKOTA: Rolette | |
| | OHIO: Delaware Gallia Guernsey Highland Jackson | WYOMING: Laramie |

TABLE E-4
Counties With High Participation In AFDC and WIC

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| CALIFORNIA: Alpine Amador Del Norte San Benito Santa Cruz Trinity | KENTUCKY: McCracken | MINNESOTA—Cont. Mille Lacs Olmsted Polk Ramsey St. Louis Wright |
| COLORADO: Bent Chaffee Crowley Fremont Pueblo | MARYLAND: Allegany Charles | MISSISSIPPI: Claiborne |
| CONNECTICUT: Tolland Windham | MICHIGAN: Alger Alpena Antrim Bay Benzie Charlevoix Cheboygan Chippewa Crawford Delta Dickinson Emmet Gogebic Grand Traverse Houghton Huron Iron Kalamazoo Keweenaw Lake Lapeer Luce Mackinac Manistee Marquette Mason Menominee Oceana Ontonagon Osceola Oscoda Otsego Roscommon Sanilac Schoolcraft Shiawassee St. Clair Tuscola Washtenaw | MISSOURI: Boone Ralls St. Francois Stoddard Washington |
| GEORGIA: Twiggs | | MONTANA: Silver Bow |
| ILLINOIS: Adams Alexander Bond Cass Effingham Fulton Grundy Hardin Henderson Lee Logan Massac Menard Montgomery Perry Pope Randolph Stephenson Union | | NEBRASKA: Adams Hall Lincoln |
| IOWA: Clinton Dallas Des Moines Linn Page Union Wapello | | NEVADA: Esmeralda |
| KANSAS: Cherokee Crawford Saline Shawnee | MINNESOTA: Anoka Cass Clay Itasca Kandiyohi Koochiching Lake | NEW JERSEY: Warren |
| | | NEW YORK: Chautauqua Orleans |
| | | NORTH CAROLINA: Scotland |
| | | NORTH DAKOTA: Rolette |
| | | OHIO: Auglaize Clark Crawford Darke Erie Gallia Guernsey Harrison Henry Hocking Jackson Mahoning Meigs Mercer |

TABLE E-4—Cont.
Counties With High Participation In AFDC and WIC

| | | |
|------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| OHIO—Cont. | VERMONT: | WISCONSIN—Cont. |
| Miami | Bennington | Jefferson |
| Monroe | Chittenden | Juneau |
| Morgan | Franklin | Kewaunee |
| Morrow | Rutland | La Crosse |
| Noble | Windsor | Langlade |
| Paulding | | Lincoln |
| Perry | VIRGINIA: | Marathon |
| Pickaway | Buena Vista | Marinette |
| Pike | Charlottesville | Marquette |
| Preble | Fredericksburg | Menominee |
| Ross | Hopewell | Oneida |
| Tuscarawas | Richmond City | Pepin |
| Van Wert | Staunton | Portage |
| Vinton | | Racine |
| Washington | WASHINGTON: | Rock |
| | Chelan | Rusk |
| | Columbia | Sawyer |
| PENNSYLVANIA: | WEST VIRGINIA: | Sheboygan |
| Blair | Wirt | St. Croix |
| Cameron | | Trempealeau |
| Elk | WISCONSIN: | Vilas |
| Fayette | Ashland | Walworth |
| Greene | Bayfield | Waushara |
| Washington | Brown | |
| Westmoreland | Burnett | WYOMING: |
| Wyoming | Door | Carbon |
| | Eau Claire | Laramie |
| SOUTH CAROLINA: | Florence | Natrona |
| Allendale | Fond du Lac | Sheridan |
| Newberry | Forest | Uinta |
| Union | Jack | |

TABLE E-5
Counties With Low Participation In AFDC, Head Start and WIC

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| COLORADO: Cheyenne Eagle Grand Pitkin Summit | MONTANA: Carter Daniels Fallon Fergus Garfield Golden Valley Judith Basin Liberty Madison McCone Musselshell Petroleum Prairie Sheridan Sweet Grass Toole Treasure Wheatland Wibaux | NORTH DAKOTA: Golden Valley Logan Oliver Stark |
| IDAHO: Blaine Butte Caribou Franklin Fremont Jefferson Lincoln Madison Oneida Teton | | OKLAHOMA: Alfalfa Beaver Cimarron Dewey Ellis Grant Harper Woodward |
| INDIANA: Lagrange Marshall Pulaski Rush | | OREGON: Wheeler |
| KANSAS: Barber Coffey Comanche Decatur Edwards Ellis Ellsworth Gove Graham Harper Haskell Hodgeman Jewell Kiowa Lincoln Marion Meade Ness Norton Osborne Pratt Rawlins Republic Russell Sheridan Smith Stanton Trego Washington | NEBRASKA: Arthur Banner Blaine Boone Butler Chase Cuming Dixon Frontier Furnas Garfield Gosper Hayes Hitchcock Hooker Logan McPherson Nance Pawnee Perkins Pierce Polk Thomas Wayne | SOUTH DAKOTA: Campbell Clark Deuel Hamlin Hanson Harding Jackson |
| | NEVADA: Eureka Nye | TEXAS: Anderson Archer Armstrong Bandera Borden Briscoe Callahan Carson Collingsworth Concho Coryell Delta Donley Eastland Edwards Erath Fisher Foard Franklin Hamilton Hansford Hartley Haskell Hemphill Hood Hopkins Irion Jack |
| | NEW MEXICO: Lincoln Los Alamos | |

(121)

TABLE E-5—*Cont.*

Counties With Low Participation In AFDC, Head Start and WIC

| | | |
|-------------|--------------|-------------|
| TEXAS—Cont. | TEXAS—Cont. | TEXAS—Cont. |
| Kendall | Parker | Wheeler |
| Kenedy | Rains | Wise |
| Kent | Reagan | Wood |
| Kimble | Roberts | Young |
| King | Rockwall | |
| Knox | Schleicher | UTAH: |
| Lee | Scurry | Beaver |
| Lipscomb | Shackelford | Rich |
| Live Oak | Sherman | Wayne |
| Menard | Somervell | |
| Mitchell | Stephens | VIRGINIA: |
| Moore | Sterling | Lexington |
| Motley | Stonewall | Rockingham |
| Nolan | Sutton | |
| Ochiltree | Throckmorton | WYOMING: |
| Oldham | Van Zandt | Lincoln |
| | | Sublette |

TABLE E-6
Counties With Low Participation In AFDC and Head Start

| | | |
|--------------------|-------------------|----------------------|
| ALABAMA: | INDIANA: | MONTANA—Cont. |
| Bibb | Lagrange | Liberty |
| Blount | Marshall | Madison |
| Chilton | Pulaski | McCone |
| Dale | Rush | Meagher |
| Lamar | | Musselshell |
| Marion | IOWA: | Petroleum |
| Winston | Mitchell | Phillips |
| ARKANSAS: | KANSAS: | Powder River |
| Grant | Barber | Prairie |
| Howard | Cheyenne | Sheridan |
| Lonoke | Coffey | Stillwater |
| Montgomery | Comanche | Sweet Grass |
| Pike | Decatur | Teton |
| Sevier | Dickinson | Toole |
| CALIFORNIA: | Edwards | Treasure |
| Sierra | Ellis | Wheatland |
| COLORADO: | Ellsworth | Wibaux |
| Baca | Gove | NEBRASKA: |
| Cheyenne | Graham | Antelope |
| Custer | Greeley | Arthur |
| Douglas | Harper | Banner |
| Eagle | Haskell | Blaine |
| Grand | Hodgeman | Boone |
| Hinsdale | Jewell | Boyd |
| Kit Carson | Kiowa | Brown |
| Ouray | Lincoln | Butler |
| Park | Marion | Chase |
| Pitkin | Marshall | Cherry |
| Summit | Meade | Cuming |
| Yuma | Ness | Dixon |
| GEORGIA: | Norton | Franklin |
| Brantley | Osborne | Frontier |
| Murray | Pratt | Furnas |
| IDAHO: | Rawlins | Garfield |
| Adams | Republic | Gosper |
| Bear Lake | Russell | Harlan |
| Blaine | Sheridan | Hayes |
| Butte | Smith | Hitchcock |
| Caribou | Stanton | Holt |
| Clark | Trego | Hooker |
| Custer | Washington | Johnson |
| Elmore | LOUISIANA: | Kearney |
| Franklin | Cameron | Keya Paha |
| Fremont | MONTANA: | Logan |
| Jefferson | Broadwater | McPherson |
| Lemhi | Carter | Nance |
| Lincoln | Chouteau | Pawnee |
| Madison | Daniels | Perkins |
| Oneida | Fallon | Pierce |
| Owyhee | Fergus | Poik |
| Teton | Garfield | Rock |
| | Golden Valley | Stanton |
| | Judith Basin | |

(123)

TABLE E-6—*Cont.*
Counties With Low Participation In AFDC and Head Start

| | | |
|-----------------|---------------|-------------|
| NEBRASKA—Cont. | OKLAHOMA: | TEXAS—Cont. |
| Thomas | Alfalfa | Coryell |
| Wayne | Beaver | Crane |
| NEVADA: | Cimarron | Culberson |
| Eureka | Dewey | Delta |
| Lander | Ellis | Donley |
| Lincoln | Grant | Eastland |
| Nye | Harper | Edwards |
| Pershing | Major | Erath |
| NEW MEXICO: | Woods | Fisher |
| Harding | Woodward | Foard |
| Lincoln | OREGON: | Franklin |
| Los Alamos | Morrow | Gaines |
| NORTH CAROLINA: | Sherman | Glasscock |
| Alexander | Wheeler | Hamilton |
| Alleghany | SOUTH DAKOTA: | Hansford |
| Ashe | Bon Homme | Hartley |
| Currituck | Campbell | Haskell |
| Polk | Clark | Hemphill |
| Pandolph | Deuel | Hood |
| Wilkes | Grant | Hopkins |
| NORTH DAKOTA: | Haakon | Hudspeth |
| Adams | Hamlin | Irion |
| Barnes | Hanson | Jack |
| Billings | Harding | Jeff Davis |
| Bowman | Hyde | Kendall |
| Burke | Jackson | Kenedy |
| Cavalier | Jones | Kent |
| Dickey | Lincoln | Kimble |
| Divide | McCook | King |
| Emmons | Moody | Knox |
| Golden Valley | Perkins | Lamb |
| Hettinger | Potter | Lee |
| Kidder | Stanley | Lipscomb |
| La Moure | Sully | Live Oak |
| Logan | TENNESSEE: | McMullen |
| McIntosh | Lewis | Menard |
| Nelson | Van Buren | Mitchell |
| Oliver | TEXAS: | Moore |
| Pembina | Anderson | Motley |
| Ransom | Andrews | Nolan |
| Renville | Archer | Ochiltree |
| Richland | Armstrong | Oldham |
| Sheridan | Bandera | Parker |
| Slope | Borden | Parmer |
| Stark | Brewster | Pecos |
| Steele | Briscoe | Presidio |
| Towner | Callahan | Rains |
| Walsh | Carson | Randall |
| Wells | Castro | Reagan |
| | Collingsworth | Roberts |
| | Comanche | Rockwall |
| | Concho | Schleicher |
| | | Scurry |
| | | Shackelford |

TABLE E-6—*Cont.*
 Counties With Low Participation In AFDC and Head Start

| | | |
|--------------|--------------|----------------|
| TEXAS—Cont. | UTAH: | VIRGINIA—Cont. |
| Sherman | Beaver | Madison |
| Somervell | Daggett | Mecklenburg |
| Stephens | Garfield | Middlesex |
| Sterling | Juab | Page |
| Stonewall | Kane | Powhatan |
| Sutton | Millard | Rockingham |
| Terrell | Morgan | Spotsylvania |
| Throckmorton | Rich | |
| Van Zandt | Sanpete | WASHINGTON: |
| Ward | Summit | San Juan |
| Wheeler | Washington | |
| Winkler | Wayne | WYOMING: |
| Wise | | Crook |
| Wood | VIRGINIA: | Lincoln |
| Yoakum | Essex | Sublette |
| Young | Falls Church | |
| | Frederick | |
| | Lexington | |

TABLE E-7
Counties With Low Participation In Head Start and WIC

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| ARKANSAS: Calhoun | INDIANA—Cont. Miami Montgomery Morgan Newton Posey Pulaski Rush Shelby Starke Tipton Union White | KANSAS—Cont. Pawnee Phillips Pottawatomie Pratt Rawlins Republic Rice Rooks Rush Russell Seward Sheridan Smith Stafford Stanton Sumner Trego Washington Wilson Woodson |
| CALIFORNIA: Calaveras Mariposa | IOWA: Cedar Grundy | KENTUCKY: Meade |
| COLORADO: Cheyenne Clear Creek Delta Eagle Elbert Garfield Grand Jackson Kiowa Montrose Pitkin Rio Blanco Summit | KANSAS: Anderson Barber Barton Clark Clay Cloud Coffey Comanche Decatur Edwards Elk Ellis Ellsworth Gove Graham Gray Hamilton Harper Haskell Hodgeman Jewell Kingman Kiowa Lane Leavenworth Lincoln Logan Marion McPherson Meade Mitchell Morris Morton Ness Norton Osborne Ottawa | LOUISIANA: Plaquemines West Baton Rouge |
| FLORIDA: Highlands Monroe Santa Rosa | | MONTANA: Carbon Carter Daniels Fallon Fergus Garfield Golden Valley Judith Basin Liberty Madison McCone Musselshell Petroleum Prairie Sheridan Sweet Grass Toole Treasure Wheatland Wibaux |
| IDAHO: Blaine Boundary Butte Camas Caribou Franklin Fremont Jefferson Lincoln Madison Oneida Teton | | NEBRASKA: Arthur Banner Blaine Boone |
| ILLINOIS: Douglas Kendall McDonough | | |
| INDIANA: Benton Carroll Cass Clinton Hamilton Jasper Johnson Kosciusko Lagrange Marshall | | |

(126)

TABLE E-7—Cont.

Counties With Low Participation In Head Start and WIC

| NEBRASKA—Cont. | OKLAHOMA—Cont. | TEXAS—Cont. |
|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| Butler | Roger Mills | Hamilton |
| Chase | Woodward | Hansford |
| Colfax | | Hardin |
| Cuming | OREGON: | Hartley |
| Deuel | Benton | Haskell |
| Dixon | Curry | Hemphill |
| Dundy | Gilliam | Henderson |
| Frontier | Grant | Hood |
| Furnas | Harney | Hopkins |
| Garden | Lake | Houston |
| Garfield | Wheeler | Hunt |
| Gosper | | Irion |
| Grant | PENNSYLVANIA: | Jack |
| Hayes | Northumberland | Jasper |
| Hitchcock | | Johnson |
| Hooker | SOUTH DAKOTA: | Jones |
| Logan | Campbell | Kendall |
| McPherson | Clark | Kenedy |
| Nance | Deuel | Kent |
| Pawnee | Hamiin | Kerr |
| Perkins | Hanson | Kimble |
| Pierce | Harding | King |
| Polk | Jackson | Knox |
| Sarpy | TEXAS: | Lamar |
| Saunders | Anderson | Lavaca |
| Thomas | Archer | Lee |
| Washington | Armstrong | Lipscomb |
| Wayne | Austin | Live Oak |
| NEVADA: | Bandera | Menard |
| Eureka | Baylor | Milam |
| Nye | Borden | Mitchell |
| NEW MEXICO: | Briscoe | Moore |
| Lea | Callahan | Morris |
| Lincoln | Camp | Motley |
| Los Alamos | Carson | Newton |
| NEW YORK: | Chambers | Nolan |
| Putnam | Coke | Ochiltree |
| NORTH DAKOTA: | Collingsworth | Oldham |
| Golden Valley | Colorado | Parker |
| Logan | Concho | Rains |
| Oliver | Coryell | Reagan |
| Stark | Crockett | Roberts |
| OKLAHOMA: | Delta | Rockwall |
| Alfalfa | Donley | San Jacinto |
| Beaver | Eastland | Schleicher |
| Cimarron | Edwards | Scurry |
| Dewey | Ellis | Shackelford |
| Ellis | Erath | Sherman |
| Grant | Falls | Somervell |
| Harper | Fayette | Stephens |
| | Fisher | Sterling |
| | Foard | Stonewall |
| | Franklin | Sutton |
| | Freestone | Throckmorton |

TABLE E-7—*Cont.*

Counties With Low Participation In Head Start and WIC

| | | |
|-------------|------------------|----------------|
| TEXAS—Cont. | VIRGINIA: | WASHINGTON: |
| Titus | Bath | Pacific |
| Trinity | Buchanan | Lewis |
| Tyler | Clarke | Whitman |
| Van Zandt | Colonial Heights | Garfield |
| Waller | Emporia | |
| Wheeler | Hampton | WEST VIRGINIA: |
| Wise | Harrisonburg | Jefferson |
| Wood | Highland | |
| Young | Lexington | WISCONSIN: |
| | Manassas | Calumet |
| UTAH: | Richmond | |
| Beaver | Rockingham | WYOMING: |
| Rich | Shenandoah | Lincoln |
| Sevier | Waynesboro | Sublette |
| Wayne | Winchester | Teton |

TABLE E-8
Counties With Low Participation In AFDC and WIC

| | | |
|------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| ARKANSAS: | KANSAS—Cont. | NEBRASKA—Cont. |
| Boone | Hodgeman | Cuming |
| Carroll | Jewell | Dixon |
| Cleburne | Kiowa | Frontier |
| Garland | Lincoln | Furnas |
| Greene | Marion | Garfield |
| Logan | Meade | Gosper |
| Madison | Ness | Greeley |
| Polk | Norton | Hayes |
| Sebastian | Osborne | Hitchcock |
| Stone | Pratt | Hooker |
| White | Rawlins | Knox |
| COLORADO: | Republic | Logan |
| Cheyenne | Russell | McPherson |
| Eagle | Scott | Nance |
| Grand | Sheridan | Pawnee |
| Pitkin | Smith | Perkins |
| Summit | Stanton | Pierce |
| FLORIDA: | Trego | Polk |
| Clay | Washington | Saline |
| IDAHO: | MINNESOTA: | Sioux |
| Blaine | Renville | Thayer |
| Butte | Rock | Thomas |
| Caribou | MONTANA: | Valley |
| Franklin | Carter | Wayne |
| Fremont | Daniels | NEVADA: |
| Gooding | Fallon | Eureka |
| Jefferson | Fergus | Nye |
| Lincoln | Garfield | NEW MEXICO: |
| Madison | Golden Valley | Catron |
| Oneida | Judith Basin | Lincoln |
| Teton | Liberty | Los Alamos |
| INDIANA: | Madison | Otero |
| Lagrange | McCone | Valencia |
| Marshall | Musselshell | NORTH DAKOTA: |
| Pulaski | Petroleum | Dunn |
| Rush | Prairie | Golden Valley |
| IOWA: | Sheridan | Grant |
| Lyon | Sweet Grass | Logan |
| KANSAS: | Toole | Oliver |
| Barber | Treasure | Stark |
| Coffey | Wheatland | OHIO: |
| Comanche | Wibaux | Holmes |
| Decatur | Yellowstone National | OKLAHOMA: |
| Edwards | Park | Alfalfa |
| Ellis | NEBRASKA: | Beaver |
| Ellsworth | Arthur | Canadian |
| Gove | Banner | Cimarron |
| Graham | Blaine | Dewey |
| Harper | Boone | Ellis |
| Haskell | Butler | Grant |
| | Cedar | |
| | Chase | |

TABLE E-8—Cont.
Counties With Low Participation In AFDC and WIC

| OKLAHOMA—Cont. | TEXAS—Cont. | TEXAS—Cont. |
|----------------|-------------|----------------|
| Harper | Eastland | Nolan |
| Woodward | Edwards | Ochiltree |
| OREGON: | Erath | Oldham |
| Wheeler | Fisher | Parker |
| SOUTH DAKOTA: | Foard | Rains |
| Campbell | Franklin | Reagan |
| Clark | Gillespie | Real |
| Deuel | Gray | Roberts |
| Douglas | Guadalupe | Rockwall |
| Faulk | Hall | Runnels |
| Hamlin | Hamilton | Schleicher |
| Hand | Hansford | Scurry |
| Hanson | Hardeman | Shackelford |
| Harding | Hartley | Sherman |
| Hutchinson | Haskell | Somervell |
| Jackson | Hemphill | Stephens |
| Kingsbury | Hood | Sterling |
| Marshall | Hopkins | Stonewall |
| TEXAS: | Hutchinson | Sutton |
| Anderson | Irion | Swisher |
| Archer | Jack | Throckmorton |
| Armstrong | Kendall | Uvalde |
| Bandera | Kenedy | Van Zandt |
| Blanco | Kent | Wheeler |
| Borden | Kimble | Wilbarger |
| Bosque | King | Wilson |
| Briscoe | Knox | Wise |
| Burnet | Lampasas | Wood |
| Callahan | Lee | Young |
| Carson | Leon | UTAH: |
| Clay | Limestone | Beaver |
| Collingsworth | Lipscomb | Rich |
| Concho | Live Oak | Wayne |
| Cooke | Llano | VIRGINIA: |
| Coryell | Mason | Lexington |
| Cottle | McCulloch | Rockingham |
| Dallam | Medina | Virginia Beach |
| Delta | Menard | WYOMING: |
| Dickens | Mitchell | Lincoln |
| Donley | Montague | Snake |
| | Moore | |
| | Motley | |

TABLE E-9
Child Poverty Counties With High Participation
In AFDC, Head Start and WIC

ILLINOIS:
Alexander

MISSISSIPPI:
Claiborne

OHIO:
Pike

MICHIGAN:
Lake

NORTH DAKOTA:
Rolette

TABLE E-10
Child Poverty Counties With High Participation
In Head Start and WIC

| | | |
|---------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|
| COLORADO: | MISSISSIPPI—Cont. | OHIO: |
| Otero | Franklin | Pike |
| Saguache | Greene | |
| GEORGIA: | Grenada | OKLAHOMA: |
| Morgan | Jasper | Atoka |
| Schley | Jefferson | Tillman |
| Stewart | Leake | |
| ILLINOIS: | Montgomery | SOUTH CAROLINA: |
| Alexander | Newton | Clarendon |
| | Noxubee | Fairfield |
| | Perry | McCormick |
| KENTUCKY: | Winston | |
| Fleming | Yalobusha | SOUTH DAKOTA: |
| Lee | | Lyman |
| Martin | MISSOURI: | |
| Robertson | Carter | TENNESSEE: |
| Wolfe | Reynolds | Jackson |
| | Wright | |
| LOUISIANA: | | TEXAS: |
| St. Helena | NEW MEXICO: | Bailey |
| | Union | Bee |
| MICHIGAN: | | Dimmit |
| Lake | NORTH CAROLINA: | Mills |
| | Madison | Willacy |
| MISSISSIPPI: | Swain | Zapata |
| Benton | | Zavala |
| Claiborne | NORTH DAKOTA: | |
| Clay | Rolette | |

TABLE E-11
Child Poverty Counties With High Participation
In AFDC and Head Start

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| ILLINOIS: Alexander Pulaski | MISSOURI: Dunklin Mississippi | OHIO: Pike |
| MICHIGAN: Lake | NEBRASKA: Thurston | WEST VIRGINIA: McDowell Mingo |
| MISSISSIPPI: Claiborne | NORTH DAKOTA: Rolette | |

TABLE E-12
Child Poverty Counties With High Participation In AFDC and WIC

ILLINOIS:
 Alexander

MISSISSIPPI:
 Claiborne

OHIO:
 Pike

MICHIGAN:
 Lake

NORTH DAKOTA:
 Rolette

SOUTH CAROLINA:
 Allendale

VIRGINIA:
 Richmond City

TABLE E-13
Child Poverty Counties With Low Participation
In AFDC, Head Start and WIC

| | | |
|------------------|----------------------|---------------|
| MONTANA: | NEVADA: | TEXAS: |
| Carter | Eureka | Briscoe |
| Garfield | | Collingsworth |
| Judith Basin | NORTH DAKOTA: | Concho |
| Petroleum | Logan | Edwards |
| Prairie | | Haskell |
| Treasure | SOUTH DAKOTA: | Kenedy |
| | Campbell | King |
| NEBRASKA: | Clark | Knox |
| Arthur | Deuel | Menard |
| Banner | Hamlin | Mitchell |
| Blaine | Hanson | Motley |
| Hayes | Harding | |
| Logan | Jackson | |

TABLE E-14
Child Poverty Counties With Low Participation In AFDC and WIC

| | | |
|------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| ARKANSAS: | NORTH DAKOTA: | TEXAS—Cont. |
| Polk | Dunn | Cottle |
| Stone | Grant | Dickens |
| | Logan | Edwards |
| MONTANA: | SOUTH DAKOTA: | Hall |
| Carter | Campbell | Hardeman |
| Garfield | Clark | Haskell |
| Judith Basin | Deuel | Kenedy |
| Petroleum | Douglas | King |
| Prairie | Faulk | Knox |
| Treasure | Hamlin | Leon |
| NEBRASKA: | Hand | Limestone |
| Arthur | Hanson | Mason |
| Banner | Harding | McCulloch |
| Blaine | Hutchinson | Medina |
| Greeley | Jackson | Menard |
| Hayes | Kingsbury | Mitchell |
| Logan | Marshall | Motley |
| NEVADA: | TEXAS: | Reai |
| Eureka | Briscoe | Runnels |
| | Collingsworth | Swisher |
| | Concho | Uvalde |
| | | Wilbarger |

TABLE E-15
Child Poverty Counties With Low Participation
In AFDC and Head Start

| | | |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|
| ALABAMA: Bibb | NEVADA: Eureka | TEXAS: Briscoe |
| COLORADO: Baca | NORTH DAKOTA: Billings | Castro |
| IDAHO: Owyhee | Emmons | Collingsworth |
| MONTANA: Carter | Hettinger | Concho |
| Garfield | Kidder | Edwards |
| Judith Basin | Logan | Gaines |
| Petroleum | McIntosh | Glasscock |
| Prairie | Sheridan | Haskell |
| Treasure | Slope | Hudspeth |
| NEBRASKA: Arthur | SOUTH DAKOTA: Bon Homme | Jeff Davis |
| Banner | Campbell | Kenedy |
| Blaine | Clark | King |
| Boyd | Deuel | Knox |
| Hayes | Hamlin | Lamb |
| Logan | Hanson | Menard |
| | Harding | Mitchell |
| | Hyde | Motley |
| | Jackson | Parmer |
| | Potter | Presidio |
| | Sully | |

TABLE E-16
Child Poverty Counties With Low Participation
In Head Start and WIC

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| ARKANSAS: Calhoun | NEBRASKA—Cont. Hayes Logan | TEXAS: Briscoe Collingsworth Concho |
| FLORIDA: Highlands | NEVADA: Eureka | Edwards Falls |
| MONTANA: Carter Garfield Judith Basin Petroleum Prairie Treasure | NORTH DAKOTA: Logan | Haskell Houston Kenedy King |
| NEBRASKA: Arthur Banner Blaine | SOUTH DAKOTA: Campbell Clark Deuel Hamlin Hanson Harding Jackson | Knox Menard Mitchell Motley San Jacinto |

APPENDIX F

Tables Relating to Participation in AFDC

| | Page |
|--|------|
| Table F-1—Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County | 141 |
| Table F-2—1984 AFDC High Participation Counties | 206 |
| Table F-3—1984 AFDC Low Participation Counties..... | 211 |
| Table F-4—1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County | 216 |
| Table F-5—1979 AFDC High Participation Counties | 253 |
| Table F-6—1979 AFDC Low Participation Counties..... | 258 |
| Table F-7—Child Poverty Counties With High Participation In AFDC—1984 | 263 |
| Table F-8—Child Poverty Counties With Low Participation In AFDC—1984 | 264 |
| Table F-9—Child Poverty Counties With High Participation In AFDC—1979 | 266 |
| Table F-10—Child Poverty Counties With Low Participation In AFDC—1979 | 267 |

TABLE F-1

Absolute and Percent Change in Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits
Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

| State and County | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979 | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984 | Absolute Change | Percent Change |
|------------------|--|--|--------------------|-------------------|
| Alabama: | | | | |
| Autauga..... | 1,194 | 867 | -327 | -27 |
| Baldwin..... | 1,336 | 1,179 | -157 | -12 |
| Barbour..... | 1,388 | 1,119 | -269 | -19 |
| Bibb..... | 412 | 309 | -103 | -25 |
| Blount..... | 411 | 370 | -41 | -10 |
| Bullock..... | 756 | 789 | 33 | 4 |
| Butler..... | 1,091 | 1,079 | -12 | -1 |
| Calhoun..... | 3,069 | 2,436 | -633 | -21 |
| Chambers..... | 1,557 | 1,339 | -218 | -14 |
| Cherokee..... | 186 | 240 | 54 | 29 |
| Chilton..... | 555 | 417 | -138 | -25 |
| Choctaw..... | 1,179 | 795 | -384 | -33 |
| Clarke..... | 1,649 | 1,475 | -174 | -11 |
| Clay..... | 254 | 174 | -80 | -31 |
| Cleburne..... | 172 | 135 | -37 | -22 |
| Coffee..... | 753 | 596 | -157 | -21 |
| Colbert..... | 1,043 | 786 | -257 | -25 |
| Conecuh..... | 935 | 514 | -421 | -45 |
| Coosa..... | 424 | 281 | -143 | -34 |
| Covington..... | 850 | 505 | -345 | -41 |
| Crenshaw..... | 600 | 433 | -167 | -28 |
| Cullman..... | 498 | 454 | -44 | -9 |
| Dale..... | 602 | 629 | 27 | 4 |
| Dallas..... | 4,259 | 4,151 | -108 | -3 |
| De Kalb..... | 728 | 640 | -88 | -12 |
| Elmore..... | 1,202 | 877 | -325 | -27 |
| Escambia..... | 1,309 | 927 | -382 | -29 |
| Etowah..... | 2,033 | 1,548 | -485 | -24 |
| Fayette..... | 268 | 358 | 90 | 34 |
| Franklin..... | 532 | 442 | -90 | -17 |
| Geneva..... | 774 | 515 | -259 | -33 |
| Greene..... | 1,340 | 1,111 | -229 | -17 |
| Hale..... | 1,193 | 935 | -258 | -22 |
| Henry..... | 839 | 411 | -428 | -51 |
| Houston..... | 2,241 | 1,455 | -786 | -35 |
| Jackson..... | 698 | 608 | -90 | -13 |
| Jefferson..... | 23,223 | 19,945 | -3,278 | -14 |
| Lamar..... | 303 | 220 | -83 | -27 |
| Lauderdale..... | 1,274 | 945 | -329 | -26 |
| Lawrence..... | 1,092 | 549 | -543 | -50 |
| Lee..... | 1,692 | 1,408 | -284 | -17 |
| Limestone..... | 999 | 653 | -346 | -35 |
| Lowndes..... | 1,903 | 1,325 | -578 | -30 |
| Macon..... | 2,310 | 1,940 | -370 | -16 |
| Madison..... | 3,881 | 3,068 | -813 | -21 |
| Marion..... | 2,016 | 1,386 | -630 | -31 |
| Marshall..... | 394 | 293 | -101 | -26 |
| | 1,002 | 715 | -287 | -29 |

(141)

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits
Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

| State and County | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979 | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984 | Absolute Change | Percent Change |
|------------------|--|--|--------------------|-------------------|
| Mobile | 14,987 | 15,030 | 43 | 0 |
| Monroe | 1,026 | 718 | -308 | -30 |
| Montgomery | 7,019 | 6,987 | -32 | -0 |
| Morgan | 1,718 | 1,484 | -234 | -14 |
| Perry | 1,474 | 1,341 | -133 | -9 |
| Pickens | 1,666 | 1,356 | -310 | -19 |
| Pike | 1,294 | 1,211 | -83 | -6 |
| Randolph | 515 | 445 | -70 | -14 |
| Russell | 1,285 | 1,252 | -33 | -3 |
| Shelby | 1,041 | 727 | -314 | -30 |
| St. Clair | 885 | 712 | -173 | -20 |
| Sumter | 1,650 | 1,366 | -284 | -17 |
| Talladega | 3,598 | 3,091 | -507 | -14 |
| Tallapoosa | 1,283 | 744 | -539 | -42 |
| Tuscaloosa | 4,882 | 4,332 | -550 | -11 |
| Walker | 1,749 | 1,253 | -496 | -28 |
| Washington | 448 | 738 | 290 | 65 |
| Wilcox | 2,178 | 1,508 | -670 | -31 |
| Winston | 215 | 129 | -86 | -40 |
| Total | 127,332 | 107,770 | -19,562 | -15 |
| Alaska: | | | | |
| Alaska | 9,955 | 9,037 | -918 | -9 |
| Total | 9,955 | 9,037 | -918 | -9 |
| Arizona: | | | | |
| Apache | 3,338 | 3,406 | 68 | 2 |
| Cochise | 1,023 | 1,819 | 796 | 78 |
| Coconino | 1,637 | 1,745 | 108 | 7 |
| Gila | 665 | 1,151 | 486 | 73 |
| Graham | 455 | 779 | 324 | 71 |
| Greenlee | 149 | 201 | 52 | 35 |
| Maricopa | 15,185 | 23,814 | 8,629 | 57 |
| Mohave | 236 | 604 | 368 | 156 |
| Navajo | 1,872 | 2,304 | 432 | 23 |
| Pima | 6,292 | 10,076 | 3,784 | 60 |
| Pinal | 2,187 | 3,361 | 1,174 | 54 |
| Santa Cruz | 250 | 467 | 217 | 87 |
| Yavapai | 300 | 853 | 553 | 184 |
| Yuma | 730 | 1,302 | 572 | 78 |
| Total | 34,319 | 51,882 | 17,563 | 51 |
| Arkansas: | | | | |
| Arkansas | 716 | 492 | -224 | -31 |
| Ashley | 1,087 | 682 | -405 | -37 |
| Baxter | 169 | 143 | -26 | -15 |
| Benton | 848 | 319 | -529 | -62 |
| Boone | 248 | 155 | -93 | -38 |
| Bradley | 450 | 282 | -168 | -37 |
| Calhoun | 212 | 162 | -50 | -24 |
| Carroll | 128 | 85 | -43 | -34 |

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits
Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

| State and County | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979 | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984 | Absolute Change | Percent Change |
|-------------------|--|--|--------------------|-------------------|
| Chicot..... | 1,859 | 1,427 | -432 | -23 |
| Clark..... | 414 | 327 | -87 | -21 |
| Clay..... | 443 | 330 | -113 | -26 |
| Cleburne..... | 153 | 107 | -46 | -30 |
| Cleveland..... | 182 | 112 | -70 | -38 |
| Columbia..... | 1,063 | 856 | -207 | -19 |
| Conway..... | 451 | 333 | -118 | -26 |
| Craighead..... | 956 | 835 | -121 | -13 |
| Crawford..... | 507 | 478 | -29 | -6 |
| Crittenden..... | 3,351 | 2,320 | -1,022 | -30 |
| Cross..... | 841 | 685 | -156 | -19 |
| Dallas..... | 433 | 332 | -101 | -23 |
| Desha..... | 1,314 | 867 | -447 | -34 |
| Drew..... | 453 | 331 | -122 | -27 |
| Faulkner..... | 307 | 245 | -62 | -20 |
| Franklin..... | 125 | 113 | -12 | -10 |
| Fulton..... | 127 | 4 | -123 | -97 |
| Garland..... | 1,226 | 634 | -592 | -48 |
| Grant..... | 121 | 83 | -38 | -31 |
| Greene..... | 438 | 359 | -79 | -18 |
| Hempstead..... | 574 | 0 | -574 | -100 |
| Hot Spring..... | 410 | 381 | -29 | -7 |
| Howard..... | 167 | 69 | -98 | -59 |
| Independence..... | 383 | 320 | -63 | -16 |
| Izard..... | 106 | 111 | 5 | 5 |
| Jackson..... | 746 | 604 | -142 | -19 |
| Jefferson..... | 3,485 | 3,535 | 50 | 1 |
| Johnson..... | 236 | 106 | -130 | -55 |
| Lafayette..... | 520 | 397 | -123 | -24 |
| Lawrence..... | 399 | 319 | -80 | -20 |
| Lee..... | 1,725 | 1,189 | -536 | -31 |
| Lincoln..... | 640 | 492 | -148 | -23 |
| Little River..... | 399 | 247 | -152 | -38 |
| Logan..... | 352 | 283 | -69 | -20 |
| Lonoke..... | 701 | 412 | -289 | -41 |
| Madison..... | 150 | 113 | -37 | -25 |
| Marion..... | 130 | 118 | -12 | -9 |
| Miller..... | 1,153 | 840 | -313 | -27 |
| Mississippi..... | 2,957 | 2,096 | -861 | -29 |
| Monroe..... | 1,005 | 712 | -293 | -29 |
| Montgomery..... | 111 | 40 | -71 | -64 |
| Nevada..... | 465 | 252 | -213 | -46 |
| Newton..... | 164 | 102 | -62 | -38 |
| Ouachita..... | 1,369 | 856 | -513 | -37 |
| Perry..... | 131 | 80 | -51 | -39 |
| Phillips..... | 4,330 | 3,313 | -1,017 | -23 |
| Pike..... | 167 | 95 | -72 | -43 |
| Poinsett..... | 1,034 | 859 | -175 | -17 |
| Polk..... | 370 | 211 | -159 | -43 |
| Pope..... | 541 | 412 | -129 | -24 |

117

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits
Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

| State and County | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979 | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984 | Absolute Change | Percent Change |
|-------------------|--|--|--------------------|-------------------|
| Prairie..... | 285 | 194 | -91 | -32 |
| Pulaski..... | 10,442 | 5,301 | -5,141 | -49 |
| Randolph..... | 194 | 158 | -36 | -19 |
| Saline..... | 555 | 368 | -187 | -34 |
| Scott..... | 219 | 153 | -66 | -30 |
| Searcy..... | 148 | 99 | -49 | -33 |
| Sebastian..... | 1,136 | 591 | -545 | -48 |
| Sevier..... | 148 | 107 | -41 | -28 |
| Sharp..... | 298 | 267 | -31 | -10 |
| St. Francis..... | 2,205 | 1,950 | -255 | -12 |
| Stone..... | 231 | 174 | -57 | -25 |
| Union..... | 2,001 | 1,294 | -707 | -35 |
| Van Buren..... | 210 | 193 | -17 | -8 |
| Washington..... | 1,102 | 751 | -351 | -32 |
| White..... | 694 | 449 | -245 | -35 |
| Woodruff..... | 606 | 485 | -121 | -20 |
| Yell..... | 332 | 194 | -138 | -42 |
| Total..... | 64,348 | 44,399 | -19,949 | -31 |
| California: | | | | |
| Alameda..... | 49,916 | 49,987 | 71 | 0 |
| Alpine..... | 29 | 88 | 59 | 203 |
| Amador..... | 264 | 544 | 280 | 106 |
| Butte..... | 4,525 | 6,733 | 2,208 | 49 |
| Calaveras..... | 601 | 1,044 | 443 | 74 |
| Colusa..... | 254 | 504 | 250 | 98 |
| Contra Costa..... | 22,435 | 20,956 | -1,479 | -7 |
| Del Norte..... | 733 | 1,416 | 683 | 93 |
| El Dorado..... | 1,637 | 2,671 | 1,034 | 63 |
| Fresno..... | 27,087 | 43,164 | 16,077 | 59 |
| Glenn..... | 518 | 813 | 295 | 57 |
| Humboldt..... | 3,909 | 5,402 | 1,493 | 38 |
| Imperial..... | 4,248 | 4,995 | 747 | 18 |
| Inyo..... | 338 | 607 | 269 | 80 |
| Kern..... | 14,044 | 17,223 | 3,179 | 23 |
| Kings..... | 3,925 | 4,780 | 855 | 22 |
| Lake..... | 1,512 | 1,906 | 394 | 26 |
| Lassen..... | 702 | 1,132 | 430 | 61 |
| Los Angeles..... | 367,628 | 395,459 | 27,831 | 8 |
| Madera..... | 3,180 | 4,087 | 907 | 29 |
| Marin..... | 2,371 | 1,767 | -604 | -25 |
| Mariposa..... | 236 | 632 | 396 | 168 |
| Mendocino..... | 2,994 | 3,907 | 913 | 30 |
| Merced..... | 7,403 | 12,400 | 4,997 | 67 |
| Modoc..... | 285 | 492 | 207 | 73 |
| Mono..... | 144 | 128 | -16 | -11 |
| Monterey..... | 9,780 | 9,984 | 204 | 2 |
| Napa..... | 1,987 | 2,006 | 19 | 1 |
| Nevada..... | 1,004 | 1,838 | 834 | 83 |
| Orange..... | 30,360 | 38,571 | 8,211 | 27 |

148

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits
Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

| State and County | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979 | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984 | Absolute Change | Percent Change |
|----------------------|--|--|--------------------|-------------------|
| Placer..... | 3,121 | 3,968 | 847 | 27 |
| Plumas..... | 410 | 648 | 238 | 58 |
| Riverside..... | 24,857 | 33,633 | 8,776 | 35 |
| Sacramento..... | 42,900 | 56,837 | 13,937 | 32 |
| San Benito..... | 727 | 1,001 | 274 | 38 |
| San Bernardino..... | 37,795 | 52,813 | 15,018 | 40 |
| San Diego..... | 57,708 | 68,477 | 10,769 | 19 |
| San Francisco..... | 27,838 | 24,155 | -3,683 | -13 |
| San Joaquin..... | 20,938 | 32,955 | 12,017 | 57 |
| San Luis Obispo..... | 2,992 | 2,982 | -10 | -0 |
| San Mateo..... | 10,818 | 6,640 | -4,178 | -39 |
| Santa Barbara..... | 6,985 | 6,561 | -424 | -6 |
| Santa Clara..... | 41,010 | 39,520 | -1,490 | -4 |
| Santa Cruz..... | 5,231 | 4,714 | -517 | -10 |
| Shasta..... | 4,873 | 7,714 | 2,841 | 58 |
| Sierra..... | 72 | 0 | -72 | -100 |
| Siskiyou..... | 1,161 | 2,238 | 1,077 | 93 |
| Solano..... | 8,402 | 8,727 | 325 | 4 |
| Sonoma..... | 9,631 | 8,863 | -868 | -9 |
| Stanislaus..... | 12,148 | 17,358 | 5,210 | 43 |
| Sutter..... | 1,878 | 2,828 | 950 | 51 |
| Tehama..... | 1,278 | 2,008 | 730 | 57 |
| Trinity..... | 416 | 709 | 293 | 70 |
| Tulare..... | 15,932 | 20,836 | 4,904 | 31 |
| Tuolumne..... | 803 | 1,597 | 794 | 99 |
| Ventura..... | 14,771 | 13,295 | -1,476 | -10 |
| Yolo..... | 3,956 | 4,876 | 920 | 23 |
| Yuba..... | 2,858 | 4,065 | 1,207 | 42 |
| Total..... | 925,608 | 1,065,254 | 139,646 | 15 |
| Colorado: | | | | |
| Adams..... | 5,526 | 4,999 | -527 | -10 |
| Alamosa..... | 334 | 544 | 210 | 63 |
| Arapahoe..... | 1,439 | 1,699 | 260 | 18 |
| Archuleta..... | 70 | 60 | -10 | -14 |
| Baca..... | 93 | 44 | -49 | -53 |
| Bent..... | 193 | 192 | -1 | -1 |
| Boulder..... | 1,699 | 446 | -1,253 | -74 |
| Chaffee..... | 212 | 306 | 94 | 44 |
| Cheyenne..... | 3 | 36 | 27 | 300 |
| Clear Creek..... | 26 | 54 | 28 | 108 |
| Conejos..... | 410 | 355 | -55 | -13 |
| Costilla..... | 151 | 145 | -6 | -4 |
| Crowley..... | 132 | 158 | 26 | 20 |
| Custer..... | 25 | 12 | -13 | -52 |
| Delta..... | 14 | 592 | 78 | 15 |
| Denver..... | 19,554 | 15,119 | -4,435 | -23 |
| Dolores..... | 47 | 41 | -6 | -13 |
| Douglas..... | 42 | 69 | 27 | 64 |
| Eagle..... | 57 | 50 | -7 | -12 |

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits
Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

| State and County | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979 | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984 | Absolute Change | Percent Change |
|------------------|--|--|--------------------|-------------------|
| El Paso..... | 4,356 | 5,245 | 889 | 20 |
| Elbert..... | 47 | 68 | 21 | 45 |
| Fremont..... | 637 | 751 | 114 | 18 |
| Garfield..... | 142 | 211 | 69 | 49 |
| Gilpin..... | 7 | 13 | 6 | 86 |
| Grand..... | 34 | 26 | -8 | -24 |
| Gunnison..... | 17 | 46 | 29 | 171 |
| Hinsdale .. | 3 | 1 | -2 | -67 |
| Huerfano..... | 284 | 258 | -26 | -9 |
| Jackson..... | 23 | 19 | -4 | -17 |
| Jefferson..... | 2,012 | 1,196 | -816 | -41 |
| Kiowa..... | 22 | 23 | 1 | 5 |
| Kit Carson..... | 59 | 90 | 31 | 53 |
| La Plata..... | 525 | 391 | -134 | -26 |
| Lake..... | 100 | 52 | -48 | -48 |
| Larimer..... | 1,647 | 1,723 | 76 | 5 |
| Las Animas..... | 731 | 672 | -59 | -8 |
| Lincoln..... | 51 | 39 | -12 | -24 |
| Logan..... | 222 | 250 | 28 | 13 |
| Mesa..... | 1,073 | 1,821 | 748 | 70 |
| Mineral..... | 6 | 5 | -1 | -17 |
| Moffat..... | 85 | 141 | 56 | 66 |
| Montezuma..... | 218 | 391 | 173 | 79 |
| Montrose..... | 252 | 345 | 93 | 37 |
| Morgan..... | 518 | 473 | -45 | -9 |
| Otero..... | 1,368 | 1,256 | -112 | -8 |
| Ouray..... | 21 | 12 | -9 | -43 |
| Park..... | 18 | 14 | -4 | -22 |
| Phillips..... | 20 | 41 | 21 | 105 |
| Pitkin..... | 20 | 6 | -14 | -70 |
| Prowers..... | 595 | 538 | -57 | -10 |
| Pueblo..... | 5,749 | 7,285 | 1,536 | 27 |
| Rio Blanco..... | 27 | 86 | 59 | 219 |
| Rio Grande..... | 456 | 404 | -52 | -11 |
| Routt..... | 53 | 39 | -14 | -26 |
| Saguache..... | 163 | 158 | -5 | -3 |
| San Juan..... | 14 | 13 | -1 | -7 |
| San Miguel..... | 23 | 40 | 17 | 74 |
| Sedgwick..... | 38 | 41 | 3 | 8 |
| Summit..... | 2 | 6 | 4 | 200 |
| Teller..... | 74 | 85 | 11 | 15 |
| Washington..... | 46 | 61 | 15 | 33 |
| Weld..... | 3,123 | 2,784 | -339 | -11 |
| Yuma..... | 101 | 117 | 16 | 16 |
| Total..... | 55,515 | 52,157 | -3,358 | -6 |
| Connecticut: | | | | |
| Fairfield..... | 24,675 | 20,707 | -3,968 | -16 |
| Hartford..... | 29,314 | 26,684 | -2,630 | -9 |
| Litchfield..... | 1,661 | 1,512 | -149 | -9 |

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits
Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

| State and County | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979 | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984 | Absolute Change | Percent Change |
|-----------------------|--|--|--------------------|-------------------|
| Middlesex | 1,947 | 1,704 | -243 | -12 |
| New Haven | 27,127 | 24,420 | -2,707 | -10 |
| New London | 5,600 | 4,773 | -827 | -15 |
| Tolland | 1,454 | 1,176 | -278 | -19 |
| Windham | 2,438 | 2,987 | 549 | 23 |
| Total | 94,216 | 83,963 | -10,253 | -11 |
| Delaware: | | | | |
| Kent | 15,659 | 3,219 | -12,440 | -79 |
| New Castle | 3,993 | 11,519 | 7,526 | 188 |
| Sussex | 3,050 | 2,073 | -977 | -32 |
| Total | 22,702 | 16,811 | -5,891 | -26 |
| District of Columbia: | | | | |
| Washington | 61,645 | 45,536 | -16,109 | -26 |
| Total | 61,645 | 45,536 | -16,109 | -26 |
| Florida: | | | | |
| Alachua | 3,266 | 3,664 | 398 | 12 |
| Baker | 319 | 341 | 22 | 7 |
| Bay | 1,674 | 1,862 | 188 | 11 |
| Bradford | 555 | 571 | 16 | 3 |
| Brevard | 4,128 | 3,834 | -294 | -7 |
| Broward | 8,070 | 12,124 | 4,054 | 50 |
| Calhoun | 252 | 432 | 180 | 71 |
| Charlotte | 345 | 572 | 227 | 66 |
| Citrus | 798 | 801 | 3 | 0 |
| Clay | 653 | 496 | -157 | -24 |
| Collier | 989 | 1,292 | 303 | 31 |
| Columbia | 888 | 834 | -54 | -6 |
| Dade | 27,446 | 45,063 | 17,617 | 64 |
| De Soto | 366 | 550 | 184 | 50 |
| Dixie | 194 | 323 | 129 | 66 |
| Duval | 18,282 | 16,908 | -1,374 | -8 |
| Escambia | 7,140 | 7,895 | 755 | 11 |
| Flagler | 338 | 338 | 0 | 0 |
| Franklin | 342 | 329 | -13 | -4 |
| Gadsden | 2,631 | 2,998 | 367 | 14 |
| Gilchrist | 68 | 118 | 50 | 74 |
| Glades | 126 | 117 | -9 | -7 |
| Gulf | 452 | 374 | -78 | -17 |
| Hamilton | 384 | 546 | 162 | 42 |
| Hardee | 515 | 639 | 124 | 24 |
| Hendry | 707 | 780 | 73 | 10 |
| Hernando | 714 | 794 | 80 | 11 |
| Highlands | 1,093 | 1,148 | 55 | 5 |
| Hillsborough | 14,658 | 1,026 | -13,632 | -93 |
| Holmes | 356 | 374 | 18 | 5 |
| Indian River | 919 | 873 | -46 | -5 |
| Jackson | 1,088 | 1,133 | 45 | 4 |
| Jefferson | 442 | 479 | 37 | 8 |

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits
Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

| State and County | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979 | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984 | Absolute Change | Percent Change |
|------------------|--|--|--------------------|-------------------|
| Lafayette | 38 | 74 | 36 | 95 |
| Lake | 1,508 | 1,917 | 409 | 27 |
| Lee | 2,353 | 3,575 | 1,222 | 52 |
| Leon | 3,139 | 2,714 | -425 | -14 |
| Levy | 450 | 659 | 209 | 46 |
| Liberty | 134 | 186 | 52 | 39 |
| Madison | 860 | 748 | -112 | -13 |
| Manatee | 1,749 | 1,890 | 141 | 8 |
| Marion | 3,222 | 3,616 | 394 | 12 |
| Martin | 611 | 818 | 207 | 34 |
| Monroe | 617 | 618 | 1 | 0 |
| Nassau | 756 | 679 | -77 | -10 |
| Okaloosa | 1,556 | 1,557 | 1 | 0 |
| Okeechobee | 433 | 532 | 99 | 23 |
| Orange | 10,032 | 8,336 | -1,196 | -12 |
| Osceola | 752 | 718 | -34 | -5 |
| Palm Beach | 6,777 | 7,129 | 352 | 5 |
| Pasco | 1,977 | 2,797 | 820 | 41 |
| Pinellas | 8,573 | 7,924 | -649 | -8 |
| Polk | 4,506 | 5,895 | 1,389 | 31 |
| Putnam | 1,825 | 2,462 | 637 | 35 |
| Santa Rosa | 882 | 999 | 117 | 13 |
| Sarasota | 1,188 | 1,459 | 271 | 23 |
| Seminole | 2,651 | 2,370 | -281 | -11 |
| St. Johns | 942 | 1,077 | 135 | 14 |
| St. Lucie | 3,115 | 3,012 | -103 | -3 |
| Sumter | 793 | 981 | 188 | 24 |
| Suwannee | 342 | 660 | 318 | 93 |
| Taylor | 490 | 518 | 28 | 6 |
| Union | 163 | 241 | 78 | 48 |
| Volusia | 4,241 | 3,956 | -285 | -7 |
| Wakulla | 277 | 353 | 76 | 27 |
| Walton | 549 | 704 | 155 | 28 |
| Washington | 416 | 451 | 35 | 8 |
| Total | 168,115 | 181,813 | 13,698 | 8 |
| Georgia: | | | | |
| Appling | 546 | 570 | 24 | 4 |
| Atkinson | 226 | 209 | -17 | -8 |
| Bacon | 362 | 428 | 66 | 18 |
| Baker | 174 | 136 | -38 | -22 |
| Baldwin | 942 | 1,231 | 289 | 31 |
| Banks | 56 | 65 | 9 | 16 |
| Barrow | 340 | 420 | 80 | 24 |
| Bartow | 663 | 720 | 57 | 9 |
| Ben Hill | 458 | 585 | 127 | 28 |
| Berrien | 320 | 348 | 28 | 9 |
| Bibb | 5,747 | 7,049 | 1,302 | 23 |
| Bleckley | 343 | 381 | 38 | 11 |
| Brantley | 157 | 136 | -21 | -13 |

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits
Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

| State and County | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979 | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984 | Absolute Change | Percent Change |
|--------------------|--|--|--------------------|-------------------|
| Brooks..... | 883 | 739 | -144 | -16 |
| Bryan..... | 345 | 392 | 47 | 14 |
| Bulloch..... | 939 | 1,285 | 346 | 37 |
| Burke..... | 1,295 | 1,527 | 232 | 18 |
| Butts..... | 451 | 483 | 32 | 7 |
| Calhoun..... | 265 | 279 | 14 | 5 |
| Camden..... | 428 | 417 | -11 | -3 |
| Candler..... | 280 | 251 | -29 | -10 |
| Carroll..... | 1,128 | 1,217 | 89 | 8 |
| Catoosa..... | 462 | 523 | 61 | 13 |
| Charlton..... | 310 | 329 | 19 | 6 |
| Chatham..... | 8,223 | 8,738 | 515 | 6 |
| Chattahoochee..... | 144 | 115 | -29 | -20 |
| Chattooga..... | 454 | 518 | 64 | 14 |
| Cherokee..... | 429 | 407 | -22 | -5 |
| Clarke..... | 1,235 | 1,929 | 694 | 56 |
| Clay..... | 226 | 291 | 65 | 29 |
| Clayton..... | 1,370 | 1,831 | 461 | 34 |
| Clinch..... | 296 | 337 | 41 | 14 |
| Cobb..... | 1,964 | 1,621 | -343 | -17 |
| Coffee..... | 878 | 998 | 120 | 14 |
| Colquitt..... | 1,498 | 1,650 | 152 | 10 |
| Columbia..... | 568 | 707 | 139 | 24 |
| Cook..... | 286 | 405 | 119 | 42 |
| Coweta..... | 1,187 | 1,626 | 439 | 37 |
| Crawford..... | 304 | 264 | -40 | -13 |
| Crisp..... | 1,398 | 1,337 | -61 | -4 |
| Dade..... | 176 | 231 | 55 | 31 |
| Dawson..... | 55 | 58 | 3 | 5 |
| De Kalb..... | 5,539 | 7,794 | 2,255 | 41 |
| Decatur..... | 1,003 | 1,381 | 378 | 38 |
| Dodge..... | 674 | 709 | 35 | 5 |
| Dooley..... | 796 | 655 | -141 | -18 |
| Dougherty..... | 5,586 | 6,266 | 680 | 12 |
| Douglas..... | 593 | 544 | -49 | -8 |
| Early..... | 972 | 978 | 6 | 1 |
| Echols..... | 88 | 90 | 2 | 2 |
| Effingham..... | 561 | 555 | -6 | -1 |
| Elbert..... | 655 | 702 | 47 | 7 |
| Emanuel..... | 947 | 1,152 | 205 | 22 |
| Evans..... | 452 | 385 | -67 | -15 |
| Fannin..... | 173 | 279 | 106 | 61 |
| Fayette..... | 106 | 121 | 15 | 14 |
| Floyd..... | 1,873 | 2,264 | 391 | 21 |
| Forsyth..... | 167 | 143 | -24 | -14 |
| Franklin..... | 244 | 311 | 67 | 27 |
| Fulton..... | 29,745 | 33,530 | 3,785 | 13 |
| Gilmer..... | 136 | 222 | 86 | 63 |
| Glascokk..... | 44 | 42 | -2 | -5 |
| Glynn..... | 1,366 | 1,421 | 55 | 4 |

SEP 153

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits
Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

| State and County | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979 | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984 | Absolute Change | Percent Change |
|------------------|--|--|--------------------|-------------------|
| Gordon..... | 387 | 472 | 85 | 22 |
| Grady..... | 690 | 630 | -60 | -9 |
| Greene..... | 337 | 394 | 57 | 17 |
| Gwinnett..... | 628 | 535 | -93 | -15 |
| Habersham..... | 127 | 218 | 91 | 72 |
| Hall..... | 847 | 1,187 | 340 | 40 |
| Hancock..... | 902 | 669 | -233 | -26 |
| Haralson..... | 326 | 323 | -3 | -1 |
| Harris..... | 334 | 291 | -43 | -13 |
| Hart..... | 264 | 380 | 116 | 44 |
| Heard..... | 139 | 165 | 26 | 19 |
| Henry..... | 813 | 774 | -39 | -5 |
| Houston..... | 1,480 | 1,718 | 238 | 16 |
| Irwin..... | 341 | 331 | -10 | -3 |
| Jackson..... | 381 | 324 | -57 | -15 |
| Jasper..... | 214 | 168 | -46 | -21 |
| Jeff Davis..... | 231 | 179 | -52 | -23 |
| Jefferson..... | 1,156 | 1,163 | 7 | 1 |
| Jenkins..... | 469 | 442 | -27 | -6 |
| Johnson..... | 302 | 329 | 27 | 9 |
| Jones..... | 426 | 401 | -25 | -6 |
| Lamar..... | 418 | 338 | -80 | -19 |
| Lanier..... | 262 | 304 | 42 | 16 |
| Laurens..... | 729 | 1,487 | 758 | 104 |
| Lee..... | 346 | 333 | -13 | -4 |
| Liberty..... | 968 | 1,083 | 115 | 12 |
| Lincoln..... | 189 | 247 | 58 | 31 |
| Long..... | 257 | 157 | -100 | -39 |
| Lowndes..... | 1,839 | 2,542 | 703 | 38 |
| Lumpkin..... | 173 | 154 | -19 | -11 |
| Macon..... | 1,030 | 990 | -40 | -4 |
| Madison..... | 246 | 316 | 70 | 28 |
| Marion..... | 291 | 228 | -63 | -22 |
| McDuffie..... | 596 | 791 | 195 | 33 |
| McIntosh..... | 500 | 374 | -126 | -25 |
| Meriwether..... | 776 | 960 | 184 | 24 |
| Miller..... | 311 | 271 | -40 | -13 |
| Mitchell..... | 1,314 | 1,446 | 132 | 10 |
| Monroe..... | 379 | 357 | -22 | -6 |
| Montgomery..... | 306 | 219 | -87 | -28 |
| Morgan..... | 363 | 423 | 60 | 17 |
| Murray..... | 114 | 168 | 54 | 47 |
| Muscogee..... | 5,271 | 6,488 | 1,217 | 23 |
| Newton..... | 788 | 1,195 | 407 | 52 |
| Oconee..... | 131 | 97 | -34 | -26 |
| Oglethorpe..... | 336 | 314 | -22 | -7 |
| Paulding..... | 402 | 368 | -34 | -8 |
| Peach..... | 899 | 1,094 | 195 | 22 |
| Pickens..... | 140 | 125 | -15 | -11 |
| Pierce..... | 296 | 246 | -50 | -17 |

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits
Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

| State and County | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979 | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984 | Absolute Change | Percent Change |
|------------------|--|--|--------------------|-------------------|
| Pike..... | 167 | 129 | -38 | -23 |
| Polk..... | 733 | 846 | 113 | 15 |
| Pulaski..... | 368 | 423 | 55 | 15 |
| Putnam..... | 350 | 362 | 12 | 3 |
| Quitman..... | 138 | 150 | 12 | 9 |
| Rabun..... | 97 | 119 | 22 | 23 |
| Randolph..... | 410 | 511 | 101 | 25 |
| Richmond..... | 6,306 | 7,982 | 1,676 | 27 |
| Rockdale..... | 470 | 398 | -72 | -15 |
| Schley..... | 176 | 133 | -43 | -24 |
| Screven..... | 631 | 755 | 124 | 20 |
| Seminole..... | 419 | 458 | 39 | 9 |
| Spalding..... | 1,169 | 1,525 | 356 | 30 |
| Stephens..... | 277 | 414 | 137 | 49 |
| Stewart..... | 511 | 440 | -71 | -14 |
| Sumter..... | 1,601 | 1,600 | -1 | -0 |
| Talbot..... | 257 | 303 | 46 | 18 |
| Taliaferro..... | 104 | 110 | 6 | 6 |
| Tattnall..... | 669 | 784 | 115 | 17 |
| Taylor..... | 579 | 524 | -55 | -9 |
| Telfair..... | 461 | 493 | 32 | 7 |
| Terrell..... | 622 | 602 | -20 | -3 |
| Thomas..... | 1,491 | 1,486 | -5 | -0 |
| Tift..... | 797 | 1,128 | 331 | 42 |
| Toombs..... | 834 | 1,001 | 167 | 20 |
| Towles..... | 53 | 53 | 0 | 0 |
| Treutlen..... | 309 | 297 | -12 | -4 |
| Troup..... | 1,283 | 1,413 | 130 | 10 |
| Turner..... | 421 | 621 | 200 | 48 |
| Twiggs..... | 533 | 513 | -20 | -4 |
| Union..... | 102 | 157 | 55 | 54 |
| Upson..... | 795 | 827 | 32 | 4 |
| Walker..... | 681 | 838 | 157 | 23 |
| Walton..... | 608 | 655 | 47 | 8 |
| Ware..... | 1,238 | 1,331 | 93 | 8 |
| Warren..... | 307 | 308 | 1 | 0 |
| Washington..... | 933 | 858 | -75 | -8 |
| Wayne..... | 739 | 839 | 100 | 14 |
| Webster..... | 118 | 109 | -9 | -8 |
| Wheeler..... | 257 | 231 | -26 | -10 |
| White..... | 47 | 36 | -11 | -23 |
| Whitfield..... | 691 | 581 | -110 | -16 |
| Wilcox..... | 337 | 293 | -44 | -13 |
| Wilkes..... | 407 | 445 | 38 | 9 |
| Wilkinson..... | 464 | 428 | -36 | -8 |
| Worth..... | 809 | 884 | 75 | 9 |
| Total..... | 150,764 | 170,928 | 20,164 | 13 |
| Hawaii: | | | | |
| Hawaii..... | 5,109 | 5,671 | 562 | 11 |

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits
Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

| State and County | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979 | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984 | Absolute Change | Percent Change |
|------------------|--|--|--------------------|-------------------|
| Honolulu | 30,379 | 25,089 | -5,290 | -17 |
| Kauai | 1,353 | 1,292 | -61 | -5 |
| Maui | 2,601 | 2,529 | -72 | -3 |
| Total | 39,442 | 34,581 | -4,861 | -12 |
| Idaho: | | | | |
| Ada | 2,580 | 2,397 | -183 | -7 |
| Adams | 42 | 28 | -14 | -33 |
| Bannock | 875 | 791 | -84 | -10 |
| Bear Lake | 42 | 64 | 22 | 52 |
| Benewah | 122 | 198 | 76 | 62 |
| Bingham | 566 | 548 | -18 | -3 |
| Blaine | 54 | 37 | -17 | -31 |
| Boise | 58 | 59 | 1 | 2 |
| Bonner | 547 | 498 | -49 | -9 |
| Bonneville | 697 | 459 | -238 | -34 |
| Boundary | 75 | 135 | 60 | 80 |
| Butte | 31 | 13 | -18 | -58 |
| Camas | 12 | 8 | -4 | -33 |
| Canyon | 1,800 | 1,732 | -68 | -4 |
| Caribou | 82 | 77 | -5 | -6 |
| Cassia | 257 | 206 | -51 | -20 |
| Clark | 9 | 5 | -4 | -44 |
| Clearwater | 151 | 124 | -27 | -18 |
| Custer | 17 | 12 | -5 | -29 |
| Elmore | 161 | 153 | -8 | -5 |
| Franklin | 42 | 27 | -15 | -36 |
| Fremont | 47 | 53 | 6 | 13 |
| Gem | 192 | 249 | 57 | 30 |
| Gooding | 155 | 101 | -54 | -35 |
| Idaho | 207 | 190 | -17 | -8 |
| Jefferson | 128 | 60 | -68 | -53 |
| Jerome | 201 | 196 | -5 | -2 |
| Kootenai | 1,175 | 1,208 | 33 | 3 |
| Latah | 232 | 161 | -71 | -31 |
| Lemhi | 124 | 111 | -13 | -10 |
| Lewis | 71 | 83 | 12 | 17 |
| Lincoln | 19 | 18 | -1 | -5 |
| Madison | 88 | 37 | -51 | -58 |
| Minidoka | 242 | 204 | -38 | -16 |
| Nez Perce | 720 | 487 | -233 | -32 |
| Oneida | 13 | 3 | -10 | -77 |
| Owyhee | 176 | 154 | -22 | -13 |
| Payette | 357 | 351 | -6 | -2 |
| Power | 112 | 84 | -28 | -25 |
| Shoshone | 486 | 532 | 46 | 9 |
| Teton | 15 | 31 | 16 | 107 |
| Twin Falls | 454 | 484 | 30 | 7 |
| Valley | 44 | 58 | 14 | 32 |
| Washington | 204 | 155 | -49 | -24 |

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits
Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

| State and County | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979 | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984 | Absolute Change | Percent Change |
|------------------|--|--|--------------------|-------------------|
| Total | 13,682 | 12,581 | - 1,101 | - 8 |
| Illinois: | | | | |
| Adams | 1,527 | 2,042 | 515 | 34 |
| Alexander | 1,036 | 1,247 | 211 | 20 |
| Bond | 202 | 398 | 196 | 97 |
| Boone | 289 | 414 | 125 | 43 |
| Brown | 46 | 69 | 23 | 50 |
| Bureau | 232 | 558 | 326 | 141 |
| Calhoun | 55 | 93 | 38 | 69 |
| Carroll | 234 | 361 | 127 | 54 |
| Cass | 222 | 375 | 153 | 69 |
| Champaign | 3,465 | 3,532 | 67 | 2 |
| Christian | 561 | 862 | 301 | 54 |
| Clark | 160 | 245 | 85 | 53 |
| Clay | 199 | 339 | 140 | 70 |
| Clinton | 234 | 435 | 201 | 86 |
| Coles | 485 | 1,058 | 573 | 118 |
| Cook | 351,017 | 333,030 | - 17,987 | - 5 |
| Crawford | 240 | 261 | 21 | 9 |
| Cumberland | 100 | 146 | 46 | 46 |
| De Kalb | 505 | 897 | 392 | 78 |
| De Witt | 137 | 278 | 141 | 103 |
| Douglas | 216 | 334 | 118 | 55 |
| Du Page | 2,955 | 3,446 | 491 | 17 |
| Edgar | 187 | 425 | 238 | 127 |
| Edwards | 73 | 130 | 57 | 78 |
| Effingham | 344 | 628 | 284 | 83 |
| Fayette | 396 | 572 | 176 | 44 |
| Ford | 224 | 196 | - 28 | - 13 |
| Franklin | 1,355 | 1,562 | 207 | 15 |
| Fulton | 938 | 1,589 | 651 | 69 |
| Gallatin | 195 | 220 | 25 | 13 |
| Greene | 415 | 565 | 150 | 36 |
| Grundy | 187 | 480 | 293 | 157 |
| Hamilton | 195 | 230 | 35 | 18 |
| Hancock | 310 | 354 | 44 | 14 |
| Hardin | 140 | 269 | 129 | 92 |
| Henderson | 131 | 217 | 86 | 66 |
| Henry | 636 | 1,408 | 772 | 121 |
| Iroquois | 435 | 548 | 113 | 26 |
| Jackson | 1,579 | 1,861 | 282 | 18 |
| Jasper | 95 | 144 | 49 | 52 |
| Jefferson | 1,194 | 1,532 | 338 | 28 |
| Jersey | 139 | 294 | 155 | 112 |
| Jo Daviess | 80 | 174 | 94 | 117 |
| Johnson | 254 | 314 | 60 | 24 |
| Kane | 5,744 | 7,075 | 1,331 | 23 |
| Kankakee | 5,426 | 5,974 | 548 | 10 |
| Kendall | 156 | 247 | 91 | 58 |

157

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits
Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

| State and County | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979 | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984 | Absolute Change | Percent Change |
|-------------------|--|--|--------------------|-------------------|
| Knox..... | 895 | 1,841 | 946 | 106 |
| La Salle | 1,225 | 2,364 | 1,139 | 93 |
| Lake | 7,033 | 7,835 | 802 | 11 |
| Lawrence..... | 354 | 401 | 47 | 13 |
| Lee..... | 249 | 678 | 429 | 172 |
| Livingston | 353 | 649 | 296 | 84 |
| Logan | 307 | 667 | 360 | 117 |
| Macon | 3,416 | 5,006 | 1,590 | 47 |
| Macoupin..... | 934 | 1,464 | 530 | 57 |
| Madison | 8,884 | 9,952 | 1,068 | 12 |
| Marion | 1,031 | 1,483 | 452 | 44 |
| Marshall..... | 52 | 222 | 170 | 327 |
| Mason | 369 | 798 | 429 | 116 |
| Massac | 474 | 659 | 185 | 39 |
| McDonough..... | 371 | 694 | 323 | 87 |
| McHenry | 681 | 985 | 304 | 45 |
| McLean..... | 1,435 | 1,866 | 431 | 30 |
| Menard | 132 | 215 | 83 | 63 |
| Mercer | 224 | 441 | 217 | 97 |
| Monroe..... | 146 | 160 | 14 | 10 |
| Montgomery | 493 | 807 | 314 | 64 |
| Morgan | 708 | 955 | 247 | 35 |
| Moultrie..... | 88 | 161 | 73 | 83 |
| Ogle..... | 386 | 723 | 337 | 87 |
| Peoria..... | 6,157 | 9,252 | 3,095 | 50 |
| Perry | 385 | 607 | 222 | 58 |
| Piatt | 194 | 204 | 10 | 5 |
| Pike..... | 503 | 477 | -26 | -5 |
| Pope..... | 162 | 193 | 31 | 19 |
| Pulaski..... | 902 | 800 | -102 | -11 |
| Putnam..... | 20 | 52 | 32 | 160 |
| Randolph..... | 425 | 657 | 232 | 55 |
| Richland | 176 | 229 | 53 | 30 |
| Rock Island | 3,828 | 6,397 | 2,569 | 67 |
| Saline..... | 707 | 849 | 142 | 20 |
| Sangamon | 4,010 | 5,496 | 1,486 | 37 |
| Schuyler | 61 | 183 | 122 | 200 |
| Scott..... | 53 | 123 | 70 | 132 |
| Shelby..... | 306 | 412 | 106 | 35 |
| St. Clair | 24,030 | 22,750 | -1,280 | -5 |
| Stark..... | 43 | 121 | 78 | 181 |
| Stephenson..... | 435 | 882 | 447 | 103 |
| Tazewell | 1,713 | 3,580 | 1,867 | 109 |
| Union..... | 422 | 579 | 157 | 37 |
| Vermilion..... | 2,554 | 3,470 | 916 | 36 |
| Wabash..... | 223 | 360 | 137 | 61 |
| Warren | 437 | 613 | 176 | 40 |
| Washington..... | 113 | 160 | 47 | 42 |
| Wayne..... | 363 | 372 | 9 | 2 |
| White | 390 | 451 | 61 | 16 |

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits
Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

| State and County | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979 | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984 | Absolute Change | Percent Change |
|------------------|--|--|--------------------|-------------------|
| Whiteside | 800 | 1,571 | 771 | 96 |
| Will..... | 7,012 | 9,271 | 2,259 | 32 |
| Williamson..... | 1,010 | 1,557 | 547 | 54 |
| Winnebago..... | 6,027 | 8,556 | 2,529 | 42 |
| Woodford..... | 221 | 568 | 347 | 157 |
| Total..... | 478,867 | 499,246 | 20,379 | 4 |
| Indiana: | | | | |
| Adams..... | 132 | 259 | 127 | 96 |
| Allen..... | 6,300 | 5,961 | -339 | -5 |
| Bartholomew..... | 1,246 | 1,239 | -7 | -1 |
| Benton..... | 91 | 90 | -1 | -1 |
| Blackford..... | 125 | 168 | 43 | 34 |
| Boone..... | 239 | 255 | 16 | 7 |
| Brown..... | 165 | 178 | 13 | 8 |
| Carroll..... | 140 | 206 | 66 | 47 |
| Cass..... | 369 | 699 | 330 | 89 |
| Clark..... | 1,964 | 1,704 | -260 | -13 |
| Clay..... | 182 | 339 | 157 | 86 |
| Clinton..... | 270 | 549 | 279 | 103 |
| Crawford..... | 184 | 157 | -27 | -15 |
| Daviess..... | 300 | 380 | 80 | 27 |
| De Kalb..... | 222 | 222 | 0 | 0 |
| Dearborn..... | 446 | 632 | 186 | 42 |
| Decatur..... | 203 | 315 | 112 | 55 |
| Delaware..... | 3,042 | 3,054 | 12 | 0 |
| Dubois..... | 177 | 142 | -35 | -20 |
| Elkhart..... | 1,751 | 1,357 | -394 | -23 |
| Fayette..... | 276 | 680 | 404 | 146 |
| Floyd..... | 1,330 | 1,441 | 111 | 8 |
| Fountain..... | 71 | 171 | 100 | 141 |
| Franklin..... | 113 | 222 | 109 | 96 |
| Fulton..... | 118 | 150 | 32 | 27 |
| Gibson..... | 384 | 372 | -12 | -3 |
| Grant..... | 1,342 | 1,868 | 526 | 39 |
| Greene..... | 161 | 178 | 17 | 11 |
| Hamilton..... | 415 | 416 | 1 | 0 |
| Hancock..... | 300 | 350 | 50 | 17 |
| Harrison..... | 141 | 305 | 164 | 116 |
| Hendricks..... | 269 | 321 | 52 | 19 |
| Henry..... | 919 | 897 | -22 | -2 |
| Howard..... | 1,096 | 1,994 | 898 | 82 |
| Huntington..... | 114 | 360 | 246 | 216 |
| Jackson..... | 539 | 653 | 114 | 21 |
| Jasper..... | 143 | 234 | 91 | 64 |
| Jay..... | 262 | 289 | 27 | 10 |
| Jefferson..... | 370 | 331 | -39 | -11 |
| Jennings..... | 258 | 363 | 105 | 41 |
| Johnson..... | 607 | 661 | 54 | 9 |
| Knox..... | 837 | 817 | -20 | -2 |

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits
Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

| State and County | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979 | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984 | Absolute Change | Percent Change |
|-------------------|--|--|--------------------|-------------------|
| Kosciusko | 324 | 437 | 113 | 35 |
| LaGrange | 129 | 57 | -72 | -56 |
| Lake | 23,633 | 25,936 | 2,303 | 10 |
| La Porte | 2,052 | 2,341 | 289 | 14 |
| Lawrence | 292 | 360 | 68 | 23 |
| Madison | 2,361 | 3,353 | 992 | 42 |
| Marion | 25,346 | 22,220 | -3,126 | -12 |
| Marshall | 306 | 209 | -97 | -32 |
| Martin | 151 | 206 | 55 | 36 |
| Miami | 300 | 466 | 166 | 55 |
| Monroe | 904 | 984 | 80 | 9 |
| Montgomery | 176 | 224 | 48 | 27 |
| Morgan | 823 | 638 | -185 | -22 |
| Newton | 110 | 157 | 47 | 43 |
| Noble | 155 | 272 | 117 | 75 |
| Ohio | 34 | 54 | 20 | 59 |
| Orange | 140 | 261 | 121 | 86 |
| Owen | 122 | 138 | 16 | 13 |
| Parke | 178 | 220 | 42 | 24 |
| Perry | 173 | 277 | 104 | 60 |
| Pike | 123 | 136 | 13 | 11 |
| Porter | 789 | 1,045 | 256 | 32 |
| Posey | 329 | 365 | 36 | 11 |
| Pulaski | 59 | 124 | 65 | 110 |
| Putnam | 137 | 182 | 45 | 33 |
| Randolph | 286 | 429 | 143 | 50 |
| Ripley | 190 | 324 | 134 | 71 |
| Rush | 133 | 166 | 33 | 25 |
| Scott | 442 | 636 | 194 | 44 |
| Shelby | 329 | 314 | -15 | -5 |
| Spencer | 152 | 151 | -1 | -1 |
| St. Joseph | 5,678 | 5,781 | 103 | 2 |
| Starke | 281 | 416 | 135 | 48 |
| Steuben | 118 | 86 | -32 | -27 |
| Sullivan | 230 | 175 | -55 | -24 |
| Switzerland | 87 | 104 | 17 | 20 |
| Tippecanoe | 945 | 982 | 37 | 4 |
| Tipton | 100 | 127 | 27 | 27 |
| Union | 77 | 109 | 32 | 42 |
| Vanderburgh | 4,445 | 3,834 | -611 | -14 |
| Vermillion | 193 | 254 | 61 | 32 |
| Vigo | 1,659 | 1,884 | 225 | 14 |
| Wabash | 275 | 402 | 127 | 46 |
| Warren | 50 | 85 | 35 | 70 |
| Warrick | 345 | 352 | 7 | 2 |
| Washington | 198 | 462 | 264 | 133 |
| Wayne | 2,223 | 2,284 | 61 | 3 |
| Wells | 151 | 256 | 105 | 70 |
| White | 148 | 137 | -11 | -7 |
| Whitley | 59 | 122 | 63 | 107 |

AL160

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits
Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

| State and County | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979 | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984 | Absolute Change | Percent Change |
|-------------------|--|--|--------------------|-------------------|
| Total | 105,553 | 111,513 | 5,960 | 6 |
| Iowa: | | | | |
| Adair | 120 | 144 | 24 | 20 |
| Adams | 73 | 69 | -4 | -5 |
| Allamakee | 253 | 238 | -15 | -6 |
| Appanoose | 692 | 815 | 123 | 18 |
| Audubon | 117 | 70 | -47 | -40 |
| Benton | 320 | 469 | 149 | 47 |
| Black Hawk | 4,705 | 5,632 | 927 | 20 |
| Boone | 459 | 575 | 116 | 25 |
| Bremer | 280 | 404 | 124 | 44 |
| Buchanan | 459 | 664 | 205 | 45 |
| Buena Vista | 280 | 322 | 42 | 15 |
| Butler | 285 | 276 | -9 | -3 |
| Calhoun | 206 | 204 | -2 | -1 |
| Carroll | 207 | 224 | 17 | 8 |
| Cass | 233 | 262 | 29 | 12 |
| Cedar | 246 | 226 | -20 | -8 |
| Cerro Gordo | 957 | 1,040 | 83 | 9 |
| Cherokee | 227 | 218 | -9 | -4 |
| Chickasaw | 177 | 245 | 68 | 38 |
| Clarke | 149 | 220 | 71 | 48 |
| Clay | 284 | 370 | 86 | 30 |
| Clayton | 294 | 304 | 10 | 3 |
| Clinton | 1,057 | 1,688 | 631 | 60 |
| Crawford | 271 | 282 | 11 | 4 |
| Dallas | 461 | 671 | 210 | 46 |
| Davis | 190 | 255 | 65 | 34 |
| Decatur | 211 | 209 | -2 | -1 |
| Delaware | 385 | 417 | 32 | 8 |
| Des Moines | 1,072 | 1,396 | 324 | 30 |
| Dickinson | 215 | 234 | 19 | 9 |
| Dubuque | 1,778 | 2,432 | 654 | 37 |
| Emmet | 225 | 321 | 96 | 43 |
| Fayette | 416 | 507 | 91 | 22 |
| Floyd | 371 | 492 | 121 | 33 |
| Franklin | 197 | 208 | 11 | 6 |
| Fremont | 162 | 186 | 24 | 15 |
| Greene | 210 | 211 | 1 | 0 |
| Grundy | 123 | 150 | 27 | 22 |
| Guthrie | 263 | 270 | 7 | 3 |
| Hamilton | 295 | 315 | 20 | 7 |
| Hancock | 171 | 153 | -18 | -11 |
| Hardin | 341 | 339 | -2 | -1 |
| Harrison | 477 | 409 | -68 | -14 |
| Henry | 307 | 389 | 82 | 27 |
| Howard | 122 | 178 | 56 | 46 |
| Humboldt | 156 | 147 | -9 | -6 |
| Ida | 84 | 72 | -12 | -14 |

001161

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits
Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

| State and County | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979 | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984 | Absolute Change | Percent Change |
|--------------------|--|--|--------------------|-------------------|
| Iowa..... | 145 | 119 | -26 | -18 |
| Jackson..... | 349 | 637 | 288 | 83 |
| Jasper..... | 739 | 821 | 82 | 11 |
| Jefferson..... | 404 | 360 | -44 | -11 |
| Johnson..... | 625 | 761 | 136 | 22 |
| Jones..... | 320 | 378 | 58 | 18 |
| Keokuk..... | 186 | 236 | 50 | 27 |
| Kossuth..... | 266 | 231 | -35 | -13 |
| Lee..... | 1,132 | 1,481 | 349 | 31 |
| Linn..... | 3,845 | 4,366 | 521 | 14 |
| Louisa..... | 332 | 427 | 95 | 29 |
| Lucas..... | 286 | 347 | 61 | 21 |
| Lyon..... | 74 | 124 | 50 | 68 |
| Madison..... | 211 | 223 | 12 | 6 |
| Mahaska..... | 499 | 571 | 72 | 14 |
| Marion..... | 505 | 607 | 102 | 20 |
| Marshall..... | 914 | 935 | 21 | 2 |
| Mills..... | 238 | 277 | 39 | 16 |
| Mitchell..... | 123 | 108 | -15 | -12 |
| Monona..... | 248 | 267 | 19 | 8 |
| Monroe..... | 175 | 241 | 66 | 38 |
| Montgomery..... | 288 | 247 | -41 | -14 |
| Muscatine..... | 1,035 | 1,292 | 257 | 25 |
| O'Brien..... | 175 | 148 | -27 | -15 |
| Osceola..... | 91 | 75 | -16 | -18 |
| Page..... | 387 | 422 | 35 | 9 |
| Palo Alto..... | 217 | 183 | -34 | -16 |
| Plymouth..... | 233 | 233 | 0 | 0 |
| Pocahontas..... | 178 | 151 | -27 | -15 |
| Polk..... | 9,508 | 10,215 | 707 | 7 |
| Pottawattamie..... | 3,306 | 2,874 | -432 | -13 |
| Poweshiek..... | 219 | 316 | 97 | 44 |
| Ringgold..... | 140 | 122 | -18 | -13 |
| Sac..... | 157 | 204 | 47 | 30 |
| Scott..... | 4,776 | 6,304 | 1,528 | 32 |
| Shelby..... | 133 | 160 | 27 | 20 |
| Sioux..... | 207 | 164 | -43 | -21 |
| Story..... | 475 | 568 | 93 | 20 |
| Tama..... | 381 | 371 | -10 | -3 |
| Taylor..... | 178 | 215 | 37 | 21 |
| Union..... | 286 | 405 | 119 | 42 |
| Van Buren..... | 173 | 217 | 44 | 25 |
| Wapello..... | 1,196 | 1,475 | 279 | 23 |
| Warren..... | 465 | 629 | 164 | 35 |
| Washington..... | 278 | 305 | 27 | 10 |
| Wayne..... | 171 | 216 | 45 | 26 |
| Webster..... | 1,401 | 1,396 | -5 | -0 |
| Winnebago..... | 148 | 116 | -32 | -22 |
| Winneshiek..... | 132 | 240 | 108 | 82 |
| Woodbury..... | 3,570 | 3,617 | 47 | 1 |

30162

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits
Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

| State and County | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979 | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984 | Absolute Change | Percent Change |
|------------------|--|--|--------------------|-------------------|
| Worth..... | 148 | 157 | 9 | 6 |
| Wright | 309 | 278 | -31 | -10 |
| Total..... | 62,560 | 71,754 | 9,194 | 15 |
| Kansas: | | | | |
| Allen | 238 | 227 | -11 | -5 |
| Anderson | 81 | 91 | 10 | 12 |
| Atchison | 343 | 494 | 151 | 44 |
| Barber | 32 | 24 | -8 | -25 |
| Barton | 280 | 352 | 72 | 26 |
| Bourbon | 298 | 326 | 28 | 9 |
| Brown | 228 | 280 | 52 | 23 |
| Butler | 635 | 702 | 67 | 11 |
| Chase | 36 | 28 | -8 | -22 |
| Chautauqua | 80 | 101 | 21 | 26 |
| Cherokee | 646 | 875 | 229 | 35 |
| Cheyenne | 21 | 22 | 1 | 5 |
| Clark | 25 | 12 | -13 | -52 |
| Clay | 152 | 118 | -34 | -22 |
| Cloud | 156 | 124 | -32 | -21 |
| Coffey | 112 | 78 | -34 | -30 |
| Comanche | 18 | 7 | -11 | -61 |
| Cowley | 636 | 633 | -3 | -1 |
| Crawford | 824 | 962 | 138 | 17 |
| Decatur | 27 | 10 | -17 | -63 |
| Dickinson | 378 | 23 | -355 | -94 |
| Doniphan | 248 | 231 | -17 | -7 |
| Douglas | 886 | 989 | 103 | 12 |
| Edwards | 53 | 23 | -30 | -57 |
| Elk | 47 | 80 | 33 | 70 |
| Ellis | 220 | 120 | -100 | -45 |
| Ellsworth | 69 | 25 | -44 | -64 |
| Finney | 428 | 315 | -113 | -26 |
| Ford | 461 | 466 | 5 | 1 |
| Franklin | 330 | 490 | 160 | 48 |
| Geary | 1,210 | 844 | -366 | -30 |
| Gove | 13 | 9 | -4 | -31 |
| Graham | 29 | 19 | -10 | -34 |
| Grant | 139 | 121 | -18 | -13 |
| Gray | 39 | 50 | 11 | 28 |
| Greeley | 28 | 15 | -13 | -46 |
| Greenwood | 162 | 135 | -27 | -17 |
| Hamilton | 24 | 32 | 8 | 33 |
| Harper | 77 | 57 | -20 | -26 |
| Harvey | 449 | 518 | 69 | 15 |
| Haskell | 42 | 30 | -12 | -29 |
| Hodgeman | 18 | 10 | -8 | -44 |
| Jackson | 194 | 243 | 49 | 25 |
| Jefferson | 157 | 160 | 3 | 2 |
| Jewell | 35 | 24 | -11 | -31 |

32163

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits
Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

| State and County | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979 | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984 | Absolute Change | Percent Change |
|--------------------|--|--|--------------------|-------------------|
| Johnson | 2,047 | 1,213 | -834 | -41 |
| Kearny | 45 | 51 | 6 | 13 |
| Kingman | 90 | 64 | -26 | -29 |
| Kiowa | 23 | 32 | 9 | 39 |
| Labette | 687 | 1,018 | 331 | 48 |
| Lane | 18 | 19 | 1 | 6 |
| Leavenworth | 985 | 981 | -4 | -0 |
| Lincoln | 23 | 34 | 11 | 48 |
| Linn | 113 | 131 | 18 | 16 |
| Logan | 22 | 34 | 12 | 55 |
| Lyon | 363 | 305 | -58 | -16 |
| Marion | 95 | 71 | -24 | -25 |
| Marshall | 143 | 110 | -33 | -23 |
| McPherson | 172 | 189 | 17 | 10 |
| Meade | 32 | 21 | -11 | -34 |
| Miami | 275 | 308 | 33 | 12 |
| Mitchell | 76 | 59 | -17 | -22 |
| Montgomery | 987 | 1,207 | 220 | 22 |
| Morris | 82 | 91 | 9 | 11 |
| Morton | 62 | 67 | 5 | 8 |
| Nemaha | 93 | 87 | -6 | -6 |
| Neosho | 309 | 292 | -17 | -6 |
| Ness | 22 | 11 | -11 | -50 |
| Norton | 50 | 27 | -23 | -46 |
| Osage | 201 | 242 | 41 | 20 |
| Osborne | 89 | 51 | -38 | -43 |
| Ottawa | 58 | 62 | 4 | 7 |
| Pawnee | 72 | 66 | -6 | -8 |
| Phillips | 66 | 38 | -28 | -42 |
| Pottawatomie | 220 | 179 | -41 | -19 |
| Pratt | 110 | 51 | -59 | -54 |
| Rawlins | 31 | 16 | -15 | -48 |
| Reno | 877 | 1,314 | 437 | 50 |
| Republic | 60 | 50 | -10 | -17 |
| Rice | 145 | 164 | 19 | 13 |
| Riley | 538 | 452 | -86 | -16 |
| Rooks | 41 | 55 | 14 | 34 |
| Rush | 35 | 36 | 1 | 3 |
| Russell | 108 | 65 | -43 | -40 |
| Saline | 864 | 919 | 55 | 6 |
| Scott | 37 | 15 | -22 | -59 |
| Sedgwick | 9,813 | 11,027 | 1,214 | 12 |
| Seward | 367 | 264 | -103 | -28 |
| Shawnee | 4,037 | 4,084 | 47 | 1 |
| Sheridan | 10 | 8 | -2 | -20 |
| Sherman | 186 | 144 | -42 | -23 |
| Smith | 41 | 35 | -6 | -15 |
| Stafford | 40 | 45 | 5 | 13 |
| Stanton | 25 | 27 | 2 | 8 |
| Stevens | 52 | 54 | 2 | 4 |

164

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits
Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

| State and County | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979 | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984 | Absolute Change | Percent Change |
|--------------------|--|--|--------------------|-------------------|
| Sumner | 291 | 344 | 53 | 18 |
| Thomas | 65 | 58 | -7 | -11 |
| Trego | 30 | 17 | -13 | -43 |
| Wabaunsee | 57 | 69 | 12 | 21 |
| Wallace | 4 | 23 | 19 | 475 |
| Washington | 75 | 55 | -20 | -27 |
| Wichita | 77 | 65 | -12 | -16 |
| Wilson | 226 | 229 | 3 | 1 |
| Woodson | 23 | 30 | 7 | 30 |
| Wyandotte | 10,132 | 10,032 | -100 | -1 |
| Total | 46,521 | 47,362 | 841 | 2 |
| Kentucky: | | | | |
| Adair | 496 | 428 | -68 | -14 |
| Allen | 212 | 242 | 30 | 14 |
| Anderson | 198 | 178 | -20 | -10 |
| Ballard | 182 | 119 | -63 | -35 |
| Barren | 712 | 637 | -75 | -11 |
| Bath | 367 | 367 | 0 | 0 |
| Bell | 2,092 | 1,741 | -351 | -17 |
| Boone | 707 | 555 | -152 | -21 |
| Bourbon | 632 | 455 | -177 | -28 |
| Boyd | 1,269 | 1,226 | -43 | -3 |
| Boyle | 563 | 519 | -44 | -8 |
| Bracken | 164 | 136 | -28 | -17 |
| Breathitt | 1,211 | 1,099 | -112 | -9 |
| Breckinridge | 622 | 493 | -129 | -21 |
| Bullitt | 777 | 818 | 41 | 5 |
| Butler | 261 | 209 | -52 | -20 |
| Caldwell | 234 | 288 | 54 | 23 |
| Calloway | 265 | 292 | 27 | 10 |
| Campbell | 2,508 | 2,307 | -201 | -8 |
| Carlisle | 119 | 106 | -13 | -11 |
| Carroll | 330 | 375 | 45 | 14 |
| Carter | 808 | 819 | 11 | 1 |
| Casey | 560 | 432 | -128 | -23 |
| Christian | 2,660 | 2,282 | -378 | -14 |
| Clark | 919 | 648 | -271 | -29 |
| Clay | 1,873 | 1,647 | -226 | -12 |
| Clinton | 365 | 288 | -77 | -21 |
| Crittenden | 126 | 165 | 39 | 31 |
| Cumberland | 285 | 218 | -67 | -24 |
| Daviess | 2,144 | 1,589 | -555 | -26 |
| Edmonson | 230 | 195 | -35 | -15 |
| Elliott | 269 | 259 | -10 | -4 |
| Estill | 684 | 627 | -57 | -8 |
| Fayette | 6,081 | 4,314 | -1,767 | -29 |
| Fleming | 291 | 226 | -65 | -22 |
| Floyd | 1,616 | 1,401 | -215 | -13 |
| Franklin | 910 | 747 | -163 | -18 |

165

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits
Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

| State and County | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979 | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984 | Absolute Change | Percent Change |
|------------------|--|--|--------------------|-------------------|
| Fulton | 626 | 492 | -134 | -21 |
| Gallatin | 109 | 143 | 34 | 31 |
| Garrard | 192 | 191 | -1 | -1 |
| Grant | 234 | 357 | 123 | 53 |
| Graves | 659 | 569 | -90 | -14 |
| Grayson | 556 | 507 | -49 | -9 |
| Green | 190 | 195 | 5 | 3 |
| Greenup | 948 | 753 | -195 | -21 |
| Hancock | 128 | 108 | -20 | -16 |
| Hardin | 1,440 | 1,145 | -295 | -20 |
| Harlan | 2,095 | 1,681 | -414 | -20 |
| Harrison | 421 | 381 | -40 | -10 |
| Hart | 616 | 559 | -57 | -9 |
| Henderson | 1,059 | 906 | -153 | -14 |
| Henry | 318 | 379 | 61 | 19 |
| Hickman | 225 | 148 | -77 | -34 |
| Hopkins | 869 | 944 | 75 | 9 |
| Jackson | 614 | 543 | -71 | -12 |
| Jefferson | 27,200 | 22,527 | -4,673 | -17 |
| Jessamine | 614 | 436 | -178 | -29 |
| Johnson | 929 | 836 | -93 | -10 |
| Kenton | 4,025 | 3,902 | -123 | -3 |
| Knott | 1,082 | 1,025 | -57 | -5 |
| Knox | 2,018 | 1,869 | -149 | -7 |
| Larue | 243 | 268 | 25 | 10 |
| Laurel | 1,261 | 1,271 | 10 | 1 |
| Lawrence | 603 | 639 | 36 | 6 |
| Lee | 483 | 376 | -107 | -22 |
| Leslie | 985 | 702 | -283 | -29 |
| Letcher | 1,278 | 1,188 | -90 | -7 |
| Lewis | 580 | 481 | -99 | -17 |
| Lincoln | 776 | 563 | -213 | -27 |
| Livingston | 134 | 135 | 1 | 1 |
| Logan | 759 | 602 | -157 | -21 |
| Lyon | 57 | 59 | 2 | 4 |
| Madison | 1,404 | 1,232 | -172 | -12 |
| Magoffin | 969 | 916 | -53 | -5 |
| Marion | 753 | 536 | -217 | -29 |
| Marshall | 207 | 272 | 65 | 31 |
| Martin | 615 | 573 | -42 | -7 |
| Mason | 403 | 397 | -6 | -1 |
| McCracken | 1,933 | 1,797 | -136 | -7 |
| McCreary | 906 | 950 | 44 | 5 |
| McLean | 191 | 203 | 12 | 6 |
| Meade | 336 | 286 | -50 | -15 |
| Menifee | 184 | 183 | -1 | -1 |
| Mercer | 341 | 256 | -85 | -25 |
| Metcalfe | 177 | 224 | 47 | 27 |
| Monroe | 443 | 353 | -90 | -20 |
| Montgomery | 694 | 608 | -86 | -12 |

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits
Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

| State and County | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979 | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984 | Absolute Change | Percent Change |
|------------------|--|--|--------------------|-------------------|
| Morgan | 530 | 425 | -105 | -20 |
| Muhlenberg | 804 | 708 | -96 | -12 |
| Nelson | 741 | 689 | -52 | -7 |
| Nicholas | 134 | 133 | -1 | -1 |
| Ohio | 475 | 547 | 72 | 15 |
| Oldham | 231 | 241 | 10 | 4 |
| Owen | 265 | 214 | -51 | -19 |
| Owsley | 472 | 393 | -79 | -17 |
| Pendleton | 254 | 276 | 22 | 9 |
| Perry | 1,262 | 1,169 | -93 | -7 |
| Pike | 1,945 | 1,867 | -78 | -4 |
| Powell | 589 | 529 | -60 | -10 |
| Pulaski | 1,231 | 1,229 | -2 | -0 |
| Robertson | 42 | 48 | 6 | 14 |
| Rockcastle | 609 | 581 | -28 | -5 |
| Rowan | 557 | 461 | -96 | -17 |
| Russell | 516 | 420 | -96 | -19 |
| Scott | 534 | 365 | -169 | -32 |
| Shelby | 500 | 554 | 54 | 11 |
| Simpson | 546 | 384 | -162 | -30 |
| Spencer | 145 | 123 | -22 | -15 |
| Taylor | 413 | 498 | 85 | 21 |
| Todd | 368 | 255 | -113 | -31 |
| Trigg | 213 | 203 | -10 | -5 |
| Trimble | 85 | 107 | 22 | 26 |
| Union | 303 | 267 | -41 | -13 |
| Warren | 1,254 | 1,296 | 42 | 3 |
| Washington | 328 | 254 | -74 | -23 |
| Wayne | 761 | 708 | -53 | -7 |
| Webster | 335 | 296 | -39 | -12 |
| Whitley | 1,388 | 1,283 | -105 | -8 |
| Wolfe | 474 | 484 | 10 | 2 |
| Woodford | 356 | 293 | -66 | -18 |
| Total | 116,292 | 101,513 | -14,779 | -13 |
| Louisiana: | | | | |
| Acadia | 1,843 | 2,113 | 270 | 15 |
| Allen | 741 | 817 | 76 | 10 |
| Ascension | 1,521 | 1,803 | 282 | 19 |
| Assumption | 585 | 820 | 235 | 40 |
| Avoyelles | 1,637 | 1,743 | 106 | 6 |
| Beauregard | 574 | 596 | 22 | 4 |
| Bienville | 500 | 588 | 88 | 18 |
| Bossier | 1,019 | 1,565 | 546 | 54 |
| Caddo | 7,516 | 9,180 | 1,664 | 22 |
| Calcasieu | 3,624 | 4,135 | 511 | 14 |
| Caldwell | 320 | 221 | -99 | -31 |
| Cameron | 29 | 81 | 52 | 179 |
| Catahoula | 480 | 504 | 24 | 5 |
| Claiborne | 759 | 832 | 73 | 10 |

367

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits
Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

| State and County | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979 | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984 | Absolute Change | Percent Change |
|----------------------------|--|--|--------------------|-------------------|
| Concordia | 1,219 | 1,335 | 116 | 10 |
| De Soto | 972 | 1,178 | 206 | 21 |
| East Baton Rouge | 10,154 | 10,118 | -36 | -0 |
| East Carroll | 1,566 | 1,405 | -161 | -10 |
| East Feliciana | 987 | 883 | -104 | -11 |
| Evangeline | 1,999 | 1,837 | -162 | -8 |
| Franklin | 1,553 | 1,243 | -310 | -20 |
| Grant | 390 | 371 | -19 | -5 |
| Iberia | 1,773 | 2,205 | 432 | 24 |
| Iberville | 1,772 | 1,854 | 82 | 5 |
| Jackson | 768 | 605 | -163 | -21 |
| Jefferson | 9,004 | 8,939 | -65 | -1 |
| Jefferson Davis | 720 | 731 | 11 | 2 |
| La Salle | 309 | 276 | -33 | -11 |
| Lafayette | 3,341 | 2,890 | -451 | -13 |
| Lafourche | 1,167 | 2,023 | 856 | 73 |
| Lincoln | 1,022 | 1,130 | 108 | 11 |
| Livingston | 718 | 866 | 148 | 21 |
| Madison | 1,734 | 1,573 | -161 | -9 |
| Morehouse | 2,374 | 2,259 | -115 | -5 |
| Natchitoches | 1,262 | 1,624 | 362 | 29 |
| Orleans | 42,322 | 40,491 | -1,831 | -4 |
| Ouachita | 4,808 | 5,334 | 526 | 11 |
| Plaquemines | 555 | 546 | -9 | -2 |
| Pointe Coupee | 1,327 | 1,266 | -61 | -5 |
| Rapides | 3,878 | 3,838 | -40 | -1 |
| Red River | 498 | 509 | 11 | 2 |
| Richland | 1,141 | 1,249 | 108 | 9 |
| Sabine | 594 | 726 | 132 | 22 |
| St. Bernard | 720 | 824 | 104 | 14 |
| St. Charles | 1,230 | 1,185 | -45 | -4 |
| St. Helena | 687 | 528 | -159 | -23 |
| St. John The Baptist | 1,841 | 1,413 | -428 | -23 |
| St. Landry | 4,799 | 4,406 | -393 | -8 |
| St. Martin | 1,318 | 1,208 | -110 | -8 |
| St. Mary | 1,994 | 2,441 | 447 | 22 |
| St. Tammany | 1,702 | 1,504 | -198 | -12 |
| Tangipahoa | 4,274 | 5,165 | 891 | 21 |
| Tensas | 815 | 709 | -106 | -13 |
| Terrebonne | 1,840 | 2,412 | 572 | 31 |
| Union | 458 | 572 | 114 | 25 |
| Vermilion | 836 | 1,272 | 436 | 52 |
| Vernon | 763 | 690 | -73 | -10 |
| Washington | 1,870 | 1,885 | 15 | 1 |
| Webster | 1,133 | 1,195 | 62 | 5 |
| West Baton Rouge | 837 | 771 | -66 | -8 |
| West Carroll | 402 | 468 | 66 | 16 |
| West Feliciana | 403 | 315 | -88 | -22 |
| Winn | 680 | 753 | 73 | 11 |
| Total | 149,777 | 154,018 | 4,241 | 3 |

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits
Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

| State and County | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979 | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984 | Absolute Change | Percent Change |
|-----------------------|--|--|--------------------|-------------------|
| Maine: | | | | |
| Androscoggin | 4,039 | 3,294 | -745 | -18 |
| Aroostook | 3,446 | 2,616 | -830 | -24 |
| Cumberland | 7,856 | 5,577 | -2,279 | -29 |
| Franklin | 875 | 801 | -74 | -8 |
| Hancock | 1,201 | 1,117 | -84 | -7 |
| Kennebec | 3,636 | 3,302 | -334 | -9 |
| Knox | 1,209 | 881 | -328 | -27 |
| Lincoln | 733 | 568 | -165 | -23 |
| Oxford | 1,890 | 1,507 | -383 | -20 |
| Penobscot | 4,635 | 3,912 | -723 | -16 |
| Piscataquis | 613 | 472 | -141 | -23 |
| Sagadahoc | 806 | 650 | -156 | -19 |
| Somerset | 2,043 | 1,795 | -248 | -12 |
| Waldo | 1,290 | 1,021 | -269 | -21 |
| Washington | 1,584 | 1,541 | -43 | -3 |
| York | 4,450 | 3,417 | -1,033 | -23 |
| Total | 40,306 | 32,471 | -7,835 | -19 |
| Maryland: | | | | |
| Allegany | 1,514 | 2,395 | 881 | 58 |
| Anne Arundel | 6,503 | 5,119 | -1,384 | -21 |
| Baltimore | 6,124 | 6,831 | 707 | 12 |
| Baltimore City | 89,741 | 74,097 | -15,644 | -17 |
| Calvert | 1,206 | 857 | -349 | -29 |
| Caroline | 714 | 531 | -183 | -26 |
| Carroll | 847 | 728 | -119 | -14 |
| Cecil | 1,328 | 1,469 | 141 | 11 |
| Charles | 1,943 | 1,835 | -108 | -6 |
| Dorchester | 1,105 | 1,059 | -46 | -4 |
| Frederick | 980 | 1,146 | 166 | 17 |
| Garrett | 578 | 689 | 111 | 19 |
| Harford | 3,063 | 2,320 | -743 | -24 |
| Howard | 529 | 542 | 13 | 2 |
| Kent | 327 | 312 | -15 | -5 |
| Montgomery | 5,420 | 4,943 | -477 | -9 |
| Prince George's | 13,643 | 12,922 | -721 | -5 |
| Queen Anne's | 509 | 537 | 28 | 6 |
| Somerset | 547 | 659 | 112 | 20 |
| St. Mary's | 1,543 | 1,228 | -315 | -20 |
| Talbot | 405 | 379 | -26 | -6 |
| Washington | 1,285 | 1,993 | 708 | 55 |
| Wicomico | 1,911 | 1,105 | -806 | -42 |
| Worcester | 477 | 672 | 195 | 41 |
| Total | 142,242 | 124,368 | -17,874 | -13 |
| Massachusetts: | | | | |
| Barnstable | 4,546 | 2,612 | -1,934 | -43 |
| Berkshire | 5,109 | 3,989 | -1,120 | -22 |
| Bristol | 22,039 | 15,349 | -6,690 | -30 |

68-169

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits
Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

| State and County | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979 | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984 | Absolute Change | Percent Change |
|----------------------|--|--|--------------------|-------------------|
| Dukes | 171 | 79 | -92 | -54 |
| Essex | 29,663 | 20,894 | -8,769 | -30 |
| Franklin | 1,859 | 2,615 | 756 | 41 |
| Hampden | 27,651 | 23,731 | -3,920 | -14 |
| Hampshire | 2,287 | 1,208 | -1,079 | -47 |
| Middlesex | 27,980 | 18,919 | -9,061 | -32 |
| Nantucket | 84 | 22 | -62 | -74 |
| Norfolk | 10,808 | 5,241 | -5,567 | -52 |
| Plymouth | 16,776 | 9,886 | -6,890 | -41 |
| Suffolk | 61,408 | 35,539 | -25,869 | -42 |
| Worcester | 25,453 | 18,205 | -7,248 | -28 |
| Total | 235,834 | 158,289 | -77,545 | -33 |
| Michigan: | | | | |
| Alcona | 335 | 433 | 98 | 29 |
| Alger | 381 | 323 | -58 | -15 |
| Allegan | 2,639 | 2,412 | -227 | -9 |
| Alpena | 1,202 | 1,693 | 491 | 41 |
| Antrim | 455 | 653 | 198 | 44 |
| Arenac | 711 | 1,024 | 313 | 44 |
| Baraga | 332 | 528 | 196 | 59 |
| Barry | 1,411 | 1,530 | 119 | 8 |
| Bay | 4,339 | 5,849 | 1,510 | 35 |
| Benzie | 397 | 506 | 109 | 27 |
| Berrien | 11,108 | 10,695 | -413 | -4 |
| Branch | 1,260 | 1,710 | 450 | 36 |
| Calhoun | 7,855 | 8,505 | 650 | 8 |
| Cass | 1,827 | 2,031 | 204 | 11 |
| Charlevoix | 526 | 725 | 199 | 38 |
| Cheboygan | 806 | 1,012 | 206 | 26 |
| Chippewa | 1,252 | 1,381 | 129 | 10 |
| Clare | 1,327 | 1,926 | 599 | 45 |
| Clinton | 1,067 | 1,142 | 75 | 7 |
| Crawford | 463 | 689 | 226 | 49 |
| Delta | 1,195 | 1,526 | 331 | 28 |
| Dickinson | 522 | 764 | 242 | 46 |
| Eaton | 1,549 | 1,972 | 423 | 27 |
| Emmet | 533 | 660 | 127 | 24 |
| Genesee | 25,705 | 30,752 | 5,047 | 20 |
| Gladwin | 939 | 1,418 | 479 | 51 |
| Gogebic | 739 | 750 | 11 | 1 |
| Grand Traverse | 1,155 | 1,327 | 172 | 15 |
| Gratiot | 1,394 | 1,592 | 198 | 14 |
| Hillsdale | 1,297 | 1,827 | 530 | 41 |
| Houghton | 1,420 | 1,360 | -60 | -4 |
| Huron | 788 | 1,160 | 372 | 47 |
| Ingham | 12,973 | 11,928 | -1,045 | -8 |
| Ionia | 1,813 | 1,951 | 138 | 8 |
| Iosco | 901 | 1,074 | 173 | 19 |
| Iron | 413 | 379 | -34 | -8 |

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits
Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

| State and County | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979 | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984 | Absolute Change | Percent Change |
|--------------------|--|--|--------------------|-------------------|
| Igabella | 1,821 | 1,751 | -70 | -4 |
| Jackson | 5,689 | 6,624 | 935 | 16 |
| Kalamazoo | 8,171 | 8,221 | 50 | 1 |
| Kalkaska | 557 | 729 | 172 | 31 |
| Kent | 16,326 | 15,583 | -743 | -5 |
| Keweenaw | 64 | 63 | -1 | -2 |
| Lake | 576 | 759 | 183 | 32 |
| Lapeer | 1,869 | 2,681 | 812 | 43 |
| Leelanau | 209 | 172 | -37 | -18 |
| Lenawee | 2,823 | 3,600 | 777 | 28 |
| Livingston | 1,736 | 2,269 | 533 | 31 |
| Luce | 235 | 395 | 160 | 68 |
| Mackinac | 438 | 357 | -81 | -18 |
| Macomb | 13,902 | 15,363 | 1,461 | 11 |
| Manistee | 615 | 1,049 | 434 | 71 |
| Marquette | 1,974 | 2,197 | 223 | 11 |
| Mason | 761 | 1,044 | 283 | 37 |
| Mecosta | 1,155 | 1,178 | 23 | 2 |
| Menominee | 762 | 927 | 165 | 22 |
| Midland | 2,343 | 2,220 | -123 | -5 |
| Missaukee | 415 | 434 | 19 | 5 |
| Monroe | 3,654 | 5,241 | 1,587 | 43 |
| Montcalm | 1,650 | 1,905 | 255 | 15 |
| Montmorency | 318 | 519 | 201 | 63 |
| Muskegon | 9,836 | 10,356 | 520 | 5 |
| Newaygo | 1,605 | 1,858 | 253 | 16 |
| Oakland | 21,444 | 25,699 | 4,255 | 20 |
| Oceana | 1,067 | 1,241 | 174 | 16 |
| Ogemaw | 840 | 1,179 | 339 | 40 |
| Ontonagon | 396 | 443 | 47 | 12 |
| Osceola | 801 | 945 | 144 | 18 |
| Oscoda | 275 | 340 | 65 | 24 |
| Otsego | 287 | 522 | 235 | 82 |
| Ottawa | 2,183 | 2,221 | 38 | 2 |
| Presque Isle | 333 | 376 | 43 | 13 |
| Roscommon | 637 | 1,103 | 466 | 73 |
| Saginaw | 14,351 | 16,521 | 2,170 | 15 |
| Sanilac | 1,494 | 1,831 | 337 | 23 |
| Schoolcraft | 339 | 338 | -1 | -0 |
| Shiawassee | 2,285 | 3,132 | 847 | 37 |
| St. Clair | 6,122 | 6,969 | 847 | 14 |
| St. Joseph | 2,040 | 1,936 | -104 | -5 |
| Tuscola | 1,932 | 2,310 | 378 | 20 |
| Van Buren | 4,458 | 3,945 | -513 | -12 |
| Washtenaw | 7,007 | 7,208 | 201 | 3 |
| Wayne | 188,941 | 209,162 | 20,222 | 11 |
| Wexford | 1,000 | 1,179 | 179 | 18 |
| Total | 430,765 | 481,303 | 50,538 | 12 |

171

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits
Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

| State and County | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979 | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984 | Absolute Change | Percent Change |
|------------------------|--|--|--------------------|-------------------|
| Minnesota: | | | | |
| Aitkin..... | 303 | 503 | 200 | 66 |
| Anoka..... | 4,194 | 3,684 | -510 | -12 |
| Becker..... | 735 | 944 | 209 | 28 |
| Beltrami..... | 1,380 | 1,741 | 361 | 26 |
| Benton..... | 333 | 504 | 171 | 51 |
| Big Stone..... | 98 | 126 | 28 | 29 |
| Blue Earth..... | 870 | 1,045 | 175 | 20 |
| Brown..... | 337 | 317 | -20 | -6 |
| Carlton..... | 760 | 1,031 | 271 | 36 |
| Carver..... | 414 | 231 | -183 | -44 |
| Cass..... | 839 | 1,140 | 301 | 36 |
| Chippewa..... | 201 | 126 | -75 | -37 |
| Chisago..... | 451 | 538 | 87 | 19 |
| Clay..... | 687 | 972 | 285 | 41 |
| Clearwater..... | 397 | 472 | 75 | 19 |
| Cook..... | 69 | 87 | 18 | 26 |
| Cottonwood..... | 179 | 165 | -14 | -8 |
| Crow Wing..... | 834 | 1,486 | 652 | 78 |
| Dakota..... | 2,950 | 2,879 | -71 | -2 |
| Dodge..... | 180 | 239 | 59 | 33 |
| Douglas..... | 391 | 395 | 4 | 1 |
| Fillmore..... | 188 | 294 | 106 | 56 |
| Freeborn..... | 478 | 694 | 216 | 45 |
| Goodhue..... | 466 | 575 | 109 | 23 |
| Grant..... | 65 | 77 | 12 | 18 |
| Hennepin..... | 26,835 | 23,950 | -2,935 | -11 |
| Houston..... | 200 | 255 | 55 | 27 |
| Hubbard..... | 437 | 502 | 65 | 15 |
| Isanti..... | 357 | 542 | 185 | 52 |
| Itasca..... | 1,398 | 1,889 | 491 | 35 |
| Jackson..... | 156 | 213 | 57 | 37 |
| Kanabec..... | 272 | 324 | 52 | 19 |
| Kandiyohi..... | 520 | 637 | 317 | 61 |
| Kittson..... | 65 | 71 | 6 | 9 |
| Koochiching..... | 500 | 523 | 23 | 5 |
| Lac qui Parle..... | 68 | 73 | 5 | 7 |
| Lake..... | 195 | 310 | 115 | 59 |
| Lake Of The Woods..... | 56 | 73 | 17 | 30 |
| Le Sueur..... | 292 | 380 | 88 | 30 |
| Lincoln..... | 528 | 768 | 240 | 45 |
| Mahnomen..... | 170 | 249 | 79 | 46 |
| Marshall..... | 136 | 123 | -13 | -10 |
| Martin..... | 621 | 989 | 368 | 59 |
| McLeod..... | 317 | 299 | -18 | -6 |
| Meeker..... | 268 | 379 | 111 | 41 |
| Mille Lacs..... | 468 | 479 | 11 | 2 |
| Morrison..... | 614 | 740 | 126 | 21 |
| Mower..... | 632 | 901 | 269 | 43 |
| Nicollet..... | 296 | 301 | 5 | 2 |

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits
Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

| State and County | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979 | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984 | Absolute Change | Percent Change |
|-----------------------|--|--|--------------------|-------------------|
| Nobles | 314 | 327 | 13 | 4 |
| Norman | 76 | 96 | 20 | 26 |
| Olmsted | 1,175 | 1,203 | 28 | 2 |
| Otter Tail | 563 | 682 | 119 | 21 |
| Pennington | 212 | 307 | 95 | 45 |
| Pine | 556 | 753 | 197 | 35 |
| Pipestone | 115 | 164 | 49 | 43 |
| Polk | 729 | 977 | 248 | 34 |
| Pope | 143 | 215 | 72 | 50 |
| Ramsey | 15,109 | 14,604 | -505 | -3 |
| Red Lake | 37 | 59 | 22 | 59 |
| Redwood | 198 | 248 | 50 | 25 |
| Renville | 187 | 141 | -46 | -25 |
| Rice | 620 | 632 | 12 | 2 |
| Rock | 80 | 101 | 21 | 26 |
| Roseau | 146 | 188 | 42 | 29 |
| Scott | 554 | 507 | -47 | -8 |
| Sherburne | 542 | 662 | 120 | 22 |
| Sibley | 115 | 165 | 50 | 43 |
| St. Louis | 6,279 | 8,497 | 2,218 | 35 |
| Stearns | 1,356 | 1,570 | 214 | 16 |
| Steele | 243 | 309 | 66 | 27 |
| Stevens | 87 | 108 | 21 | 24 |
| Swift | 242 | 213 | -29 | -12 |
| Todd | 405 | 599 | 194 | 48 |
| Traverse | 60 | 50 | -10 | -17 |
| Wabasha | 224 | 294 | 70 | 31 |
| Wadena | 283 | 462 | 179 | 63 |
| Waseca | 234 | 304 | 70 | 30 |
| Washington | 1,588 | 1,480 | -108 | -7 |
| Wilkin | 100 | 118 | 18 | 18 |
| Winona | 783 | 768 | -15 | -2 |
| Wright | 1,042 | 1,219 | 177 | 17 |
| Yellow Medicine | 133 | 170 | 37 | 28 |
| Total | 87,780 | 93,727 | 5,947 | 7 |
| Mississippi: | | | | |
| Adams | 2,677 | 1,932 | -745 | -28 |
| Alcorn | 529 | 543 | 14 | 3 |
| Amite | 477 | 521 | 44 | 9 |
| Attala | 830 | 548 | -282 | -34 |
| Benton | 439 | 368 | -71 | -16 |
| Bolivar | 5,291 | 4,960 | -331 | -6 |
| Calhoun | 601 | 425 | -176 | -29 |
| Carroll | 516 | 378 | -138 | -27 |
| Chickasaw | 609 | 386 | -223 | -37 |
| Choctaw | 443 | 370 | -73 | -16 |
| Claiborne | 907 | 1,032 | 125 | 14 |
| Clarke | 619 | 616 | -3 | -0 |
| Clay | 1,324 | 1,166 | -164 | -12 |

577 173

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits
Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

| State and County | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979 | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984 | Absolute Change | Percent Change |
|----------------------|--|--|--------------------|-------------------|
| Coahoma..... | 4,134 | 3,985 | -149 | -4 |
| Copiah..... | 1,638 | 1,436 | -202 | -12 |
| Covington..... | 946 | 826 | -120 | -13 |
| De Soto..... | 1,299 | 1,079 | -220 | -17 |
| Forrest..... | 2,257 | 1,908 | -349 | -15 |
| Franklin..... | 388 | 414 | 26 | 7 |
| George..... | 361 | 442 | 81 | 22 |
| Greene..... | 252 | 364 | 112 | 44 |
| Grenada..... | 1,240 | 878 | -362 | -29 |
| Hancock..... | 742 | 688 | -54 | -7 |
| Harrison..... | 4,680 | 3,605 | -1,075 | -23 |
| Hinds..... | 14,786 | 10,263 | -4,523 | -31 |
| Holmes..... | 3,954 | 3,289 | -665 | -17 |
| Humphreys..... | 1,750 | 1,356 | -394 | -23 |
| Issaquena..... | 262 | 211 | -51 | -19 |
| Itawamba..... | 142 | 209 | 67 | 47 |
| Jackson..... | 1,621 | 3,019 | 1,398 | 86 |
| Jasper..... | 854 | 750 | -104 | -12 |
| Jefferson..... | 1,133 | 799 | -334 | -29 |
| Jefferson Davis..... | 1,052 | 880 | -172 | -16 |
| Jones..... | 1,923 | 1,647 | -276 | -14 |
| Kemper..... | 454 | 418 | -36 | -8 |
| Lafayette..... | 768 | 592 | -176 | -23 |
| Lamar..... | 617 | 634 | 17 | 3 |
| Lauderdale..... | 3,711 | 2,994 | -717 | -19 |
| Lawrence..... | 447 | 506 | 59 | 13 |
| Leake..... | 783 | 600 | -183 | -23 |
| Lee..... | 1,207 | 883 | -324 | -27 |
| Leflore..... | 3,691 | 3,044 | -647 | -18 |
| Lincoln..... | 1,177 | 1,119 | -58 | -5 |
| Lowndes..... | 2,845 | 2,305 | -540 | -19 |
| Madison..... | 3,480 | 2,797 | -683 | -20 |
| Marion..... | 1,006 | 1,127 | 121 | 12 |
| Marshall..... | 2,446 | 1,599 | -847 | -35 |
| Monroe..... | 1,264 | 1,132 | -132 | -10 |
| Montgomery..... | 1,096 | 866 | -230 | -21 |
| Neshoba..... | 908 | 793 | -115 | -13 |
| Newton..... | 551 | 490 | -61 | -11 |
| Noxubee..... | 1,357 | 1,405 | 48 | 4 |
| Oktibbeha..... | 1,837 | 1,594 | -243 | -13 |
| Panola..... | 1,945 | 1,650 | -295 | -15 |
| Pearl River..... | 1,122 | 1,126 | 4 | 0 |
| Perry..... | 538 | 465 | -73 | -14 |
| Pike..... | 2,277 | 1,836 | -441 | -19 |
| Pontotoc..... | 447 | 363 | -84 | -19 |
| Prentiss..... | 427 | 358 | -69 | -16 |
| Quitman..... | 1,046 | 1,218 | 172 | 16 |
| Rankin..... | 556 | 712 | 156 | 28 |
| Scott..... | 827 | 818 | -9 | -1 |
| Sharkey..... | 1,135 | 840 | -295 | -26 |

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits
Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

| State and County | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979 | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984 | Absolute Change | Percent Change |
|----------------------|--|--|--------------------|-------------------|
| Simpson | 634 | 577 | -57 | -9 |
| Smith | 379 | 237 | -142 | -37 |
| Stone | 308 | 307 | -1 | -0 |
| Sunflower | 3,114 | 2,741 | -373 | -12 |
| Tallahatchie | 1,997 | 1,620 | -377 | -19 |
| Tate | 1,324 | 1,037 | -287 | -22 |
| Tippah | 614 | 550 | -264 | -43 |
| Tishomingo | 145 | 147 | 2 | 1 |
| Tunica | 1,437 | 1,478 | 41 | 3 |
| Union | 441 | 385 | -56 | -13 |
| Walthall | 1,092 | 1,026 | -66 | -6 |
| Warren | 2,811 | 2,187 | -624 | -22 |
| Washington | 6,597 | 6,344 | -253 | -4 |
| Wayne | 1,159 | 1,191 | 32 | 3 |
| Webster | 388 | 358 | -30 | -8 |
| Wilkinson | 847 | 777 | -70 | -8 |
| Winston | 1,046 | 1,058 | 12 | 1 |
| Yalobusha | 534 | 386 | -148 | -28 |
| Yazoo | 2,567 | 1,945 | -622 | -24 |
| Total | 128,075 | 109,722 | -18,353 | -14 |
| Missouri: | | | | |
| Adair | 260 | 370 | 110 | 42 |
| Andrew | 102 | 216 | 114 | 112 |
| Atchison | 76 | 65 | -11 | -14 |
| Audrain | 350 | 480 | 130 | 37 |
| Barry | 380 | 451 | 71 | 19 |
| Barton | 90 | 194 | 104 | 116 |
| Bates | 240 | 390 | 150 | 63 |
| Benton | 187 | 232 | 45 | 24 |
| Bollinger | 227 | 275 | 48 | 21 |
| Boone | 1,165 | 1,394 | 229 | 20 |
| Buchanan | 1,969 | 2,502 | 533 | 27 |
| Butler | 1,570 | 1,748 | 178 | 11 |
| Caldwell | 87 | 96 | 9 | 10 |
| Callaway | 402 | 451 | 49 | 12 |
| Camden | 271 | 285 | 14 | 5 |
| Cape Girardeau | 834 | 966 | 132 | 16 |
| Carroll | 233 | 320 | 87 | 37 |
| Carter | 155 | 253 | 98 | 63 |
| Cass | 473 | 659 | 186 | 39 |
| Cedar | 176 | 216 | 40 | 23 |
| Chariton | 187 | 146 | -41 | -22 |
| Christian | 317 | 349 | 32 | 10 |
| Clark | 123 | 225 | 102 | 83 |
| Clay | 979 | 1,187 | 208 | 21 |
| Clinton | 164 | 182 | 18 | 11 |
| Cole | 426 | 600 | 174 | 41 |
| Cooper | 197 | 198 | 1 | 1 |
| Crawford | 425 | 599 | 174 | 41 |

175

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits
Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

| State and County | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979 | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984 | Absolute Change | Percent Change |
|-------------------|--|--|--------------------|-------------------|
| Dade | 74 | 100 | 26 | 35 |
| Dallas | 185 | 232 | 47 | 25 |
| Daviess | 108 | 147 | 39 | 36 |
| De Kalb | 59 | 110 | 51 | 86 |
| Dent | 389 | 515 | 126 | 32 |
| Douglas | 178 | 306 | 128 | 72 |
| Dunklin | 2,124 | 2,370 | 246 | 12 |
| Franklin | 917 | 1,242 | 325 | 35 |
| Gasconade | 98 | 100 | 2 | 2 |
| Gentry | 65 | 148 | 83 | 128 |
| Greene | 3,647 | 3,565 | -82 | -2 |
| Grundy | 126 | 195 | 69 | 55 |
| Harrison | 127 | 179 | 52 | 41 |
| Henry | 328 | 407 | 79 | 24 |
| Hickory | 124 | 189 | 65 | 52 |
| Holt | 94 | 98 | 4 | 4 |
| Howard | 250 | 172 | -78 | -31 |
| Howell | 531 | 801 | 270 | 51 |
| Iron | 266 | 334 | 68 | 26 |
| Jackson | 22,050 | 19,016 | -3,034 | -14 |
| Jasper | 1,612 | 1,817 | 205 | 13 |
| Jefferson | 1,587 | 1,905 | 318 | 20 |
| Johnson | 368 | 443 | 75 | 20 |
| Knox | 48 | 61 | 13 | 27 |
| Laclede | 549 | 571 | 22 | 4 |
| Lafayette | 344 | 390 | 46 | 13 |
| Lawrence | 415 | 518 | 103 | 25 |
| Lewis | 159 | 266 | 107 | 67 |
| Lincoln | 219 | 247 | 28 | 13 |
| Linn | 249 | 272 | 23 | 9 |
| Livingston | 222 | 291 | 69 | 31 |
| Macon | 126 | 129 | 3 | 2 |
| Madison | 258 | 362 | 104 | 40 |
| Maries | 109 | 112 | 3 | 3 |
| Marion | 560 | 821 | 261 | 47 |
| McDonald | 345 | 399 | 54 | 16 |
| Mercer | 49 | 37 | -12 | -24 |
| Miller | 291 | 314 | 23 | 8 |
| Mississippi | 1,441 | 1,345 | -96 | -7 |
| Moniteau | 111 | 143 | 32 | 29 |
| Monroe | 121 | 92 | -29 | -24 |
| Montgomery | 198 | 192 | -6 | -3 |
| Morgan | 166 | 279 | 113 | 68 |
| New Madrid | 1,862 | 1,751 | -111 | -6 |
| Newton | 503 | 637 | 134 | 27 |
| Nodaway | 182 | 220 | 38 | 21 |
| Oregon | 225 | 259 | 34 | 15 |
| Osage | 70 | 72 | 2 | 3 |
| Ozark | 157 | 222 | 65 | 41 |
| Pemiscot | 2,844 | 2,619 | -225 | -8 |

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits
Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

| State and County | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979 | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984 | Absolute Change | Percent Change |
|----------------------|--|--|--------------------|-------------------|
| Perry | 170 | 263 | 93 | 55 |
| Pettis | 783 | 776 | -12 | -2 |
| Phelps | 523 | 561 | 38 | 7 |
| Pike | 348 | 497 | 149 | 43 |
| Platte | 348 | 420 | 72 | 21 |
| Polk | 246 | 287 | 41 | 17 |
| Pulaski | 540 | 655 | 115 | 21 |
| Putnam | 42 | 64 | 22 | 52 |
| Ralls | 73 | 138 | 65 | 89 |
| Randolph | 402 | 603 | 201 | 50 |
| Ray | 256 | 390 | 134 | 52 |
| Reynolds | 148 | 216 | 68 | 46 |
| Ripley | 485 | 753 | 268 | 55 |
| Saline | 390 | 484 | 94 | 24 |
| Schuyler | 67 | 103 | 36 | 54 |
| Scotland | 23 | 93 | 70 | 304 |
| Scott | 1,616 | 1,939 | 323 | 20 |
| Shannon | 199 | 176 | -23 | -12 |
| Shelby | 89 | 116 | 27 | 30 |
| St. Charles | 1,207 | 1,239 | 32 | 3 |
| St. Clair | 216 | 308 | 92 | 43 |
| St. Francois | 1,022 | 1,527 | 505 | 49 |
| St. Louis | 12,827 | 12,643 | -184 | -1 |
| St. Louis City | 47,345 | 39,106 | -8,239 | -17 |
| Ste. Genevieve | 176 | 237 | 61 | 35 |
| Stoddard | 760 | 973 | 213 | 28 |
| Stone | 161 | 254 | 93 | 58 |
| Sullivan | 125 | 89 | -36 | -29 |
| Taney | 296 | 273 | -23 | -8 |
| Texas | 389 | 457 | 68 | 17 |
| Vernon | 391 | 432 | 41 | 10 |
| Warren | 182 | 220 | 38 | 21 |
| Washington | 764 | 1,177 | 413 | 54 |
| Wayne | 317 | 463 | 146 | 46 |
| Webster | 234 | 222 | -12 | -5 |
| Worth | 50 | 62 | 12 | 24 |
| Wright | 322 | 441 | 119 | 37 |
| Total | 132,732 | 130,718 | -2,014 | -1 |
| Montana: | | | | |
| Beaverhead | 107 | 120 | 13 | 12 |
| Big Horn | 256 | 397 | 141 | 55 |
| Blaine | 291 | 283 | -8 | -3 |
| Broadwater | 30 | 24 | -6 | -20 |
| Carbon | 75 | 101 | 26 | 35 |
| Carter | 7 | 4 | -3 | -43 |
| Cascade | 1,517 | 1,527 | 10 | 1 |
| Chouteau | 25 | 34 | 9 | 36 |
| Custer | 137 | 207 | 70 | 51 |
| Daniels | 13 | 1 | -12 | -92 |

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits
Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

| State and County | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979 | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984 | Absolute Change | Percent Change |
|---------------------------------|--|--|--------------------|-------------------|
| Dawson | 89 | 87 | -2 | -2 |
| Deer Lodge | 265 | 276 | 11 | 4 |
| Fallon | 32 | 15 | -17 | -53 |
| Fergus | 95 | 91 | -4 | -4 |
| Flathead | 607 | 983 | 376 | 62 |
| Gallatin | 225 | 250 | 25 | 11 |
| Garfield | 5 | 4 | -1 | -20 |
| Glacier | 580 | 603 | 23 | 4 |
| Golden Valley | 4 | 7 | 3 | 75 |
| Granite | 42 | 69 | 27 | 64 |
| Hill | 423 | 486 | 63 | 15 |
| Jefferson | 60 | 63 | 3 | 5 |
| Judith Basin | 21 | 5 | -16 | -76 |
| Lake | 323 | 572 | 249 | 77 |
| Lewis And Clark | 662 | 690 | 28 | 4 |
| Liberty | 8 | 6 | -2 | -25 |
| Lincoln | 403 | 401 | -2 | -0 |
| Madison | 29 | 40 | 11 | 38 |
| McCone | 0 | 5 | 5 | . |
| Meagher | 22 | 22 | 0 | 0 |
| Mineral | 50 | 68 | 18 | 36 |
| Missoula | 1,236 | 1,215 | -21 | -2 |
| Musselshell | 73 | 56 | -17 | -23 |
| Park | 148 | 195 | 47 | 32 |
| Petroleum | 5 | 2 | -3 | -60 |
| Phillips | 42 | 55 | 13 | 31 |
| Pondera | 165 | 128 | -37 | -22 |
| Powder River | 7 | 18 | 11 | 157 |
| Powell | 102 | 135 | 33 | 32 |
| Prairie | 3 | 7 | 4 | 133 |
| Ravalli | 276 | 320 | 44 | 16 |
| Richland | 113 | 148 | 35 | 31 |
| Roosevelt | 309 | 379 | 79 | 23 |
| Rosebud | 298 | 279 | -19 | -6 |
| Sanders | 154 | 130 | -24 | -16 |
| Sheridan | 29 | 42 | 13 | 45 |
| Silver Bow | 840 | 880 | 40 | 5 |
| Stillwater | 50 | 44 | -6 | -12 |
| Sweet Grass | 18 | 27 | 9 | 50 |
| Teton | 66 | 41 | -25 | -38 |
| Toole | 74 | 56 | -18 | -24 |
| Treasure | 10 | 2 | -8 | -80 |
| Valley | 229 | 154 | -75 | -33 |
| Wheatland | 26 | 14 | -12 | -46 |
| Wibaux | 18 | 21 | 3 | 17 |
| Yellowstone | 1,692 | 1,420 | -272 | -16 |
| Yellowstone National Park | 10 | 0 | -10 | -100 |
| Total | 12,396 | 13,209 | 813 | 7 |

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits
Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

| State and County | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979 | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984 | Absolute Change | Percent Change |
|------------------|--|--|--------------------|-------------------|
| Nebraska: | | | | |
| Adams..... | 289 | 442 | 153 | 53 |
| Antelope..... | 33 | 56 | 23 | 70 |
| Arthur..... | 0 | 0 | 0 | . |
| Banner..... | 9 | 6 | -3 | -33 |
| Blaine..... | 11 | 10 | -1 | -9 |
| Boone..... | 39 | 43 | 4 | 10 |
| Box Butte..... | 130 | 144 | 14 | 11 |
| Boyd..... | 28 | 12 | -16 | -57 |
| Brown..... | 19 | 25 | 6 | 32 |
| Buffalo..... | 274 | 433 | 159 | 58 |
| Burt..... | 95 | 110 | 15 | 16 |
| Butler..... | 26 | 60 | 34 | 131 |
| Cass..... | 152 | 183 | 31 | 20 |
| Cedar..... | 57 | 46 | -11 | -19 |
| Chase..... | 50 | 38 | -12 | -24 |
| Cherry..... | 53 | 49 | -4 | -8 |
| Cheyenne..... | 79 | 61 | -18 | -23 |
| Clay..... | 109 | 108 | -1 | -1 |
| Colfax..... | 47 | 125 | 78 | 166 |
| Cuming..... | 28 | 61 | 33 | 118 |
| Custer..... | 119 | 145 | 26 | 22 |
| Dakota..... | 72 | 258 | 186 | 258 |
| Dawes..... | 111 | 164 | 53 | 48 |
| Dawson..... | 261 | 271 | 10 | 4 |
| Deuel..... | 48 | 36 | -12 | -25 |
| Dixon..... | 63 | 50 | -13 | -21 |
| Dodge..... | 257 | 470 | 213 | 83 |
| Douglas..... | 13,192 | 13,363 | 171 | 1 |
| Dundy..... | 10 | 46 | 36 | 360 |
| Fillmore..... | 53 | 63 | 10 | 19 |
| Franklin..... | 42 | 33 | -9 | -21 |
| Frontier..... | 14 | 16 | 2 | 14 |
| Furnas..... | 40 | 21 | -19 | -48 |
| Gage..... | 310 | 476 | 166 | 54 |
| Garden..... | 14 | 24 | 10 | 71 |
| Garfield..... | 34 | 16 | -18 | -53 |
| Gosper..... | 20 | 12 | -8 | -40 |
| Grant..... | 4 | 15 | 11 | 275 |
| Greeley..... | 32 | 19 | -13 | -41 |
| Hall..... | 549 | 953 | 404 | 74 |
| Hamilton..... | 78 | 108 | 30 | 38 |
| Harlan..... | 53 | 52 | -1 | -2 |
| Hayes..... | 2 | 3 | 1 | 50 |
| Hitchcock..... | 41 | 38 | -3 | -7 |
| Holt..... | 92 | 140 | 48 | 52 |
| Hooker..... | 10 | 12 | 2 | 20 |
| Howard..... | 67 | 81 | 14 | 21 |
| Jefferson..... | 79 | 126 | 47 | 59 |
| Johnson..... | 41 | 35 | -6 | -15 |

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits
Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

| State and County | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979 | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984 | Absolute Change | Percent Change |
|-------------------|--|--|--------------------|-------------------|
| Kearney..... | 22 | 40 | 18 | 82 |
| Keith..... | 126 | 123 | -3 | -2 |
| Keya Paha..... | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| Kimball..... | 52 | 59 | 7 | 13 |
| Knox..... | 76 | 163 | 87 | 114 |
| Lancaster..... | 2,799 | 3,285 | 486 | 17 |
| Lincoln..... | 492 | 711 | 219 | 45 |
| Logan..... | 10 | 12 | 2 | 20 |
| Loup..... | 9 | 10 | 1 | 11 |
| Madison..... | 244 | 358 | 114 | 47 |
| McPherson..... | 7 | 4 | -3 | -43 |
| Merrick..... | 84 | 136 | 52 | 62 |
| Morrill..... | 94 | 121 | 27 | 29 |
| Nance..... | 18 | 23 | 5 | 28 |
| Nemaha..... | 96 | 96 | 0 | 0 |
| Nuckolls..... | 45 | 79 | 34 | 76 |
| Otoe..... | 143 | 200 | 57 | 40 |
| Pawnee..... | 22 | 17 | -5 | -23 |
| Perkins..... | 22 | 12 | -10 | -45 |
| Phelps..... | 86 | 68 | -18 | -21 |
| Pierce..... | 33 | 57 | 24 | 73 |
| Platte..... | 114 | 227 | 113 | 99 |
| Polk..... | 19 | 27 | 8 | 42 |
| Red Willow..... | 56 | 126 | 70 | 125 |
| Richardson..... | 143 | 142 | -1 | -1 |
| Rock..... | 15 | 16 | 1 | 7 |
| Saline..... | 48 | 78 | 30 | 63 |
| Sarpy..... | 683 | 735 | 52 | 8 |
| Saunders..... | 127 | 204 | 77 | 61 |
| Scotts Bluff..... | 969 | 1,317 | 348 | 36 |
| Seward..... | 103 | 116 | 13 | 13 |
| Sheridan..... | 80 | 103 | 23 | 29 |
| Sherman..... | 23 | 31 | 8 | 35 |
| Sioux..... | 13 | 3 | -10 | -77 |
| Stanton..... | 13 | 35 | 22 | 169 |
| Thayer..... | 43 | 47 | 4 | 9 |
| Thomas..... | 2 | 3 | 1 | 50 |
| Thurston..... | 540 | 757 | 217 | 40 |
| Valley..... | 34 | 32 | -2 | -6 |
| Washington..... | 100 | 102 | 2 | 2 |
| Wayne..... | 34 | 47 | 13 | 38 |
| Webster..... | 48 | 70 | 22 | 46 |
| Wheeler..... | 4 | 8 | 4 | 100 |
| York..... | 124 | 143 | 19 | 15 |
| Total..... | 25,155 | 29,005 | 3,850 | 15 |
| Nevada: | | | | |
| Carson City..... | 94 | 189 | 95 | 101 |
| Churchill..... | 105 | 90 | -15 | -14 |
| Clark..... | 5,697 | 6,657 | 960 | 17 |

1980

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits
Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

| State and County | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979 | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984 | Absolute Change ^a | Percent Change |
|-------------------|--|--|---------------------------------|-------------------|
| Douglas..... | 28 | 47 | 19 | 68 |
| Elko..... | 125 | 111 | -14 | -11 |
| Esmeralda..... | 4 | 10 | 6 | 150 |
| Eureka..... | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Humboldt..... | 97 | 107 | 10 | 10 |
| Lander..... | 35 | 49 | 14 | 40 |
| Lincoln..... | 32 | 25 | -7 | -22 |
| Lyon..... | 85 | 109 | 24 | 28 |
| Mineral..... | 75 | 69 | -6 | -8 |
| Nye..... | 10 | 76 | 66 | 660 |
| Pershing..... | 17 | 19 | 2 | 12 |
| Storey..... | 7 | 4 | -3 | -43 |
| Washoe..... | 460 | 930 | 470 | 102 |
| White Pine..... | 89 | 84 | -5 | -6 |
| Total..... | 6,962 | 8,578 | 1,616 | 23 |
| New Hampshire: | | | | |
| Bellamy..... | 781 | 788 | 7 | 1 |
| Carroll..... | 283 | 323 | 40 | 14 |
| Cheshire..... | 1,012 | 1,154 | 142 | 14 |
| Coos..... | 771 | 744 | -27 | -4 |
| Grafton..... | 929 | 760 | -169 | -18 |
| Hillsborough..... | 4,416 | 3,752 | -664 | -15 |
| Merrimack..... | 1,186 | 1,133 | -53 | -4 |
| Rockingham..... | 2,764 | 1,907 | -857 | -31 |
| Strafford..... | 1,471 | 1,576 | 105 | 7 |
| Sullivan..... | 551 | 779 | 228 | 41 |
| Total..... | 14,164 | 12,916 | -1,248 | -9 |
| New Jersey: | | | | |
| Atlantic..... | 15,846 | 7,633 | -8,213 | -52 |
| Bergen..... | 6,202 | 4,141 | -2,061 | -33 |
| Burlington..... | 9,213 | 7,321 | -1,892 | -21 |
| Camden..... | 31,431 | 28,746 | -2,685 | -9 |
| Cape May..... | 2,327 | 2,077 | -250 | -11 |
| Cumberland..... | 8,952 | 8,404 | -548 | -6 |
| Essex..... | 82,859 | 70,670 | -12,189 | -15 |
| Gloucester..... | 5,849 | 5,527 | -322 | -6 |
| Hudson..... | 40,960 | 34,181 | -6,779 | -17 |
| Hunterdon..... | 752 | 398 | -354 | -47 |
| Mercer..... | 16,887 | 13,340 | -3,547 | -21 |
| Middlesex..... | 16,526 | 11,002 | -5,524 | -33 |
| Monmouth..... | 16,728 | 11,631 | -5,097 | -30 |
| Morris..... | 2,957 | 1,744 | -1,213 | -41 |
| Ocean..... | 10,602 | 7,778 | -2,824 | -27 |
| Passaic..... | 27,175 | 21,708 | -5,467 | -20 |
| Salem..... | 2,669 | 2,643 | -26 | -1 |
| Somerset..... | 2,785 | 1,695 | -1,090 | -39 |
| Sussex..... | 1,575 | 967 | -608 | -39 |
| Union..... | 15,246 | 13,388 | -1,858 | -12 |

1984

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits
Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

| State and County | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979 | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984 | Absolute Change | Percent Change |
|-------------------|--|--|--------------------|-------------------|
| Warren | 1,717 | 1,591 | -126 | -7 |
| Total | 319,258 | 256,585 | -62,673 | -20 |
| New Mexico: | | | | |
| Bernalillo | 10,425 | 9,026 | -1,399 | -13 |
| Catron | 23 | 37 | 9 | 32 |
| Chaves | 1,297 | 1,293 | -4 | -0 |
| Colfax | 389 | 348 | -41 | -11 |
| Curry | 1,387 | 1,289 | -98 | -7 |
| De Baca | 40 | 46 | 6 | 15 |
| Dona Ana | 2,272 | 2,631 | 359 | 16 |
| Eddy | 1,350 | 897 | -153 | -15 |
| Grant | 610 | 731 | 121 | 20 |
| Guadalupe | 232 | 220 | -12 | -5 |
| Harding | 12 | 3 | -9 | -75 |
| Hidalgo | 191 | 210 | 19 | 10 |
| Lea | 1,332 | 951 | -381 | -29 |
| Lincoln | 232 | 99 | -133 | -57 |
| Los Alamos | 15 | 13 | -2 | -13 |
| Luna | 395 | 561 | 166 | 42 |
| McKinley | 3,295 | 3,455 | 160 | 5 |
| Mora | 218 | 178 | -40 | -18 |
| Otero | 766 | 52 | -714 | -93 |
| Quay | 285 | 201 | -84 | -29 |
| Rio Arriba | 1,268 | 1,005 | -263 | -21 |
| Roosevelt | 508 | 602 | 94 | 19 |
| San Juan | 2,306 | 2,337 | 31 | 1 |
| San Miguel | 1,411 | 1,169 | -242 | -17 |
| Sandoval | 1,048 | 993 | -55 | -5 |
| Santa Fe | 1,791 | 1,169 | -622 | -35 |
| Sierra | 183 | 211 | 28 | 15 |
| Socorro | 469 | 484 | 15 | 3 |
| Taos | 906 | 650 | -256 | -28 |
| Torrance | 217 | 207 | -10 | -5 |
| Union | 98 | 74 | -24 | -24 |
| Valencia | 1,362 | 778 | -584 | -43 |
| Total | 36,038 | 31,920 | -4,118 | -11 |
| New York: | | | | |
| Albany | 6,754 | 4,775 | -1,979 | -29 |
| Allegany | 1,642 | 2,057 | 415 | 25 |
| Broome | 3,855 | 3,633 | -222 | -6 |
| Cattaraugus | 1,924 | 2,418 | 494 | 26 |
| Cayuga | 1,865 | 2,285 | 420 | 23 |
| Chautauqua | 4,590 | 4,546 | -44 | -1 |
| Cnemung | 2,572 | 3,554 | 982 | 38 |
| Chenango | 481 | 885 | 404 | 84 |
| Clinton | 1,871 | 1,654 | -217 | -12 |
| Columbia | 952 | 1,026 | 74 | 8 |
| Cortland | 1,264 | 1,429 | 165 | 13 |

6182

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits
Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

| State and County | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979 | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984 | Absolute Change | Percent Change |
|--------------------|--|--|--------------------|-------------------|
| Delaware | 812 | 948 | 136 | 17 |
| Dutchess | 3,644 | 3,300 | -344 | -9 |
| Erie | 33,369 | 37,834 | 4,465 | 13 |
| Essex | 1,049 | 1,075 | 26 | 2 |
| Franklin | 1,473 | 1,477 | 4 | 0 |
| Fulton | 1,024 | 1,010 | -14 | -1 |
| Genesee | 847 | 904 | 57 | 7 |
| Greene | 675 | 838 | 163 | 24 |
| Hamilton | 88 | 85 | -3 | -3 |
| Herkimer | 1,017 | 1,275 | 258 | 25 |
| Jefferson | 1,982 | 2,906 | 924 | 47 |
| Lewis | 395 | 516 | 121 | 31 |
| Livingston | 900 | 793 | -107 | -12 |
| Madison | 1,061 | 1,109 | 48 | 5 |
| Monroe | 21,860 | 23,253 | 1,393 | 6 |
| Montgomery | 926 | 1,054 | 128 | 14 |
| Nassau | 18,000 | 12,009 | -5,991 | -33 |
| New York | 531,846 | 497,278 | -34,568 | -6 |
| Niagara | 5,743 | 7,918 | 2,175 | 38 |
| Oneida | 6,913 | 7,983 | 1,070 | 15 |
| Onondaga | 12,790 | 12,250 | -540 | -4 |
| Ontario | 1,282 | 1,243 | -39 | -3 |
| Orange | 8,295 | 7,730 | -565 | -7 |
| Orleans | 987 | 1,158 | 171 | 17 |
| Oswego | 2,748 | 3,418 | 670 | 24 |
| Otsego | 920 | 912 | -8 | -1 |
| Putnam | 565 | 227 | -338 | -60 |
| Rensselaer | 3,327 | 2,977 | -350 | -11 |
| Rockland | 4,982 | 3,535 | -1,447 | -29 |
| Saratoga | 1,870 | 1,735 | -135 | -7 |
| Schenectady | 3,124 | 3,509 | 385 | 12 |
| Schoharie | 484 | 570 | 86 | 18 |
| Schuyler | 237 | 371 | 144 | 61 |
| Seneca | 334 | 415 | 81 | 24 |
| St. Lawrence | 3,382 | 4,000 | 618 | 18 |
| Steuben | 2,335 | 2,967 | 632 | 27 |
| Suffolk | 27,667 | 25,401 | -2,266 | -8 |
| Sullivan | 1,620 | 1,156 | -464 | -29 |
| Tioga | 775 | 981 | 206 | 27 |
| Tompkins | 1,499 | 1,489 | -10 | -1 |
| Ulster | 3,876 | 2,928 | -948 | -24 |
| Warren | 1,008 | 894 | -114 | -11 |
| Washington | 1,187 | 1,065 | -122 | -10 |
| Wayne | 1,525 | 1,583 | 58 | 4 |
| Westchester | 24,632 | 19,153 | -5,479 | -22 |
| Wyoming | 331 | 369 | 38 | 11 |
| Yates | 288 | 421 | 133 | 46 |
| Total | 773,464 | 734,294 | -39,170 | -5 |

SP13

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits
Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

| State and County | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979 | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984 | Absolute Change | Percent Change |
|------------------|--|--|--------------------|-------------------|
| North Carolina: | | | | |
| Alamance | 1,262 | 990 | -272 | -22 |
| Alexander | 198 | 118 | -80 | -40 |
| Alleghany | 142 | 92 | -50 | -35 |
| Anson | 535 | 643 | 108 | 20 |
| Ashe | 280 | 216 | -64 | -23 |
| Avery | 91 | 91 | 0 | 0 |
| Beaufort | 1,111 | 827 | -284 | -26 |
| Bertie | 805 | 679 | -126 | -16 |
| Bladen | 1,397 | 1,077 | -320 | -23 |
| Brunswick | 685 | 747 | 62 | 9 |
| Buncombe | 1,944 | 1,596 | -348 | -18 |
| Burke | 637 | 655 | -32 | -5 |
| Cabarrus | 1,286 | 893 | -393 | -31 |
| Caldwell | 516 | 623 | 107 | 21 |
| Camden | 173 | 99 | -74 | -43 |
| Carteret | 741 | 395 | -346 | -47 |
| Caswell | 585 | 487 | -98 | -17 |
| Catawba | 1,093 | 975 | -118 | -11 |
| Chatham | 353 | 341 | -12 | -3 |
| Cherokee | 219 | 178 | -41 | -19 |
| Chowan | 356 | 253 | -103 | -29 |
| Clay | 52 | 56 | 4 | 8 |
| Cleveland | 2,295 | 1,942 | -353 | -15 |
| Columbus | 1,385 | 1,731 | 346 | 25 |
| Craven | 2,044 | 1,354 | -690 | -34 |
| Cumberland | 8,925 | 6,952 | -1,973 | -22 |
| Currituck | 155 | 102 | -53 | -34 |
| Dare | 126 | 94 | -32 | -25 |
| Davidson | 1,393 | 1,192 | -201 | -14 |
| Davie | 254 | 178 | -76 | -30 |
| Duplin | 1,353 | 994 | -359 | -27 |
| Durham | 5,607 | 3,123 | -2,484 | -44 |
| Edgecombe | 2,731 | 2,645 | -86 | -3 |
| Forsyth | 7,296 | 5,186 | -2,110 | -29 |
| Franklin | 762 | 728 | -34 | -4 |
| Gaston | 3,346 | 3,152 | -194 | -6 |
| Gates | 207 | 224 | 17 | 8 |
| Graham | 45 | 99 | 54 | 120 |
| Granville | 586 | 670 | 84 | 14 |
| Greene | 737 | 565 | -172 | -23 |
| Guilford | 8,172 | 5,169 | -3,003 | -37 |
| Halifax | 4,094 | 3,250 | -844 | -21 |
| Harnett | 1,726 | 1,532 | -194 | -11 |
| Haywood | 533 | 541 | 8 | 2 |
| Henderson | 620 | 570 | -50 | -8 |
| Hertford | 618 | 757 | 139 | 22 |
| Hoke | 625 | 861 | 236 | 38 |
| Hyde | 146 | 169 | 23 | 16 |
| Iredell | 1,162 | 1,092 | -70 | -6 |

1984

TABLE F-1--Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits
Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

| State and County | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979 | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984 | Absolute Change | Percent Change |
|-------------------|--|--|--------------------|-------------------|
| Jackson..... | 234 | 254 | 20 | 9 |
| Johnston..... | 1,170 | 1,233 | 63 | 5 |
| Jones..... | 485 | 330 | -155 | -32 |
| Lee..... | 582 | 694 | 112 | 19 |
| Lenoir..... | 2,023 | 1,654 | -369 | -18 |
| Lincoln..... | 440 | 563 | 123 | 28 |
| Macon..... | 55 | 58 | 3 | 5 |
| Madison..... | 293 | 246 | -47 | -16 |
| Martin..... | 581 | 760 | 179 | 31 |
| McDowell..... | 406 | 326 | -80 | -20 |
| Mecklenburg..... | 12,831 | 8,760 | -4,071 | -32 |
| Mitchell..... | 175 | 124 | -51 | -29 |
| Montgomery..... | 383 | 334 | -49 | -13 |
| Moore..... | 883 | 528 | -355 | -40 |
| Nash..... | 2,296 | 1,723 | -573 | -25 |
| New Hanover..... | 2,825 | 2,491 | -334 | -12 |
| Northampton..... | 1,498 | 1,285 | -213 | -14 |
| Onslow..... | 1,232 | 1,009 | -223 | -18 |
| Orange..... | 772 | 545 | -227 | -29 |
| Pamlico..... | 254 | 206 | -48 | -19 |
| Pasquotank..... | 725 | 924 | 199 | 27 |
| Perder..... | 689 | 648 | -41 | -6 |
| Perquimans..... | 221 | 230 | 69 | 31 |
| Person..... | 781 | 645 | -136 | -17 |
| Pitt..... | 3,474 | 3,071 | -403 | -12 |
| Polk..... | 120 | 88 | -32 | -27 |
| Randolph..... | 385 | 416 | 31 | 8 |
| Richmond..... | 929 | 774 | -155 | -17 |
| Robeson..... | 5,611 | 4,716 | -895 | -16 |
| Rockingham..... | 1,470 | 1,328 | -142 | -10 |
| Rowan..... | 1,149 | 1,068 | -81 | -7 |
| Rutherford..... | 883 | 942 | 59 | 7 |
| Sampson..... | 1,292 | 1,233 | -59 | -5 |
| Scotland..... | 1,833 | 1,692 | -141 | -8 |
| Stanly..... | 573 | 374 | -199 | -35 |
| Stokes..... | 343 | 274 | -69 | -20 |
| Surry..... | 459 | 523 | 64 | 14 |
| Swain..... | 208 | 282 | 74 | 36 |
| Transylvania..... | 292 | 231 | -61 | -21 |
| Tyrrell..... | 165 | 182 | 17 | 10 |
| Union..... | 1,420 | 1,160 | -260 | -18 |
| Vance..... | 1,542 | 1,381 | -161 | -10 |
| Wake..... | 6,164 | 3,988 | -2,176 | -35 |
| Warren..... | 866 | 697 | -169 | -20 |
| Washington..... | 542 | 629 | 87 | 16 |
| Watauga..... | 280 | 217 | -63 | -23 |
| Wayne..... | 3,175 | 3,096 | -79 | -2 |
| Wilkes..... | 362 | 483 | 121 | 33 |
| Wilson..... | 1,920 | 2,251 | 331 | 17 |
| Yadkin..... | 252 | 195 | -57 | -23 |

185

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits
Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

| State and County | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979 | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984 | Absolute Change | Percent Change |
|--------------------|--|--|--------------------|-------------------|
| Yancey..... | 121 | 143 | 22 | 18 |
| Total..... | 139,118 | 113,967 | -25,151 | -18 |
| North Dakota: | | | | |
| Adams..... | 24 | 20 | -4 | -17 |
| Barnes..... | 137 | 126 | -11 | -8 |
| Benson..... | 622 | 435 | -187 | -30 |
| Billings..... | 6 | 2 | -4 | -67 |
| Bottineau..... | 87 | 120 | 33 | 38 |
| Bowman..... | 30 | 25 | -5 | -17 |
| Burke..... | 39 | 28 | -11 | -28 |
| Burleigh..... | 540 | 502 | -38 | -7 |
| Cass..... | 984 | 740 | -244 | -25 |
| Cavalier..... | 81 | 37 | -44 | -54 |
| Dickey..... | 63 | 55 | -8 | -13 |
| Divide..... | 26 | 14 | -12 | -46 |
| Dunn..... | 73 | 56 | -17 | -23 |
| Eddy..... | 61 | 46 | -15 | -25 |
| Emmons..... | 19 | 24 | 5 | 26 |
| Foster..... | 68 | 58 | -10 | -15 |
| Golden Valley..... | 16 | 17 | 1 | 6 |
| Grand Forks..... | 594 | 392 | -202 | -34 |
| Grant..... | 33 | 19 | -14 | -42 |
| Griggs..... | 28 | 29 | 1 | 4 |
| Hettinger..... | 24 | 33 | 9 | 38 |
| Kidder..... | 57 | 22 | -35 | -61 |
| La Moure..... | 42 | 38 | -4 | -10 |
| Logan..... | 18 | 15 | -3 | -17 |
| McHenry..... | 99 | 63 | -36 | -36 |
| McIntosh..... | 35 | 19 | -16 | -46 |
| McKenzie..... | 120 | 166 | 46 | 38 |
| McLean..... | 219 | 181 | -38 | -17 |
| Macer..... | 64 | 41 | -23 | -36 |
| Morton..... | 255 | 307 | 52 | 20 |
| Mountrail..... | 204 | 210 | 6 | 3 |
| Nelson..... | 42 | 22 | -20 | -48 |
| Oliver..... | 8 | 15 | 7 | 88 |
| Pembina..... | 202 | 92 | -110 | -54 |
| Pierce..... | 73 | 49 | -24 | -33 |
| Ramsey..... | 140 | 141 | 1 | 1 |
| Ransom..... | 83 | 44 | -39 | -47 |
| Renville..... | 25 | 8 | -17 | -68 |
| Richland..... | 141 | 93 | -48 | -34 |
| Rolette..... | 1,580 | 1,307 | -273 | -17 |
| Sargent..... | 49 | 48 | -1 | -2 |
| Sheridan..... | 34 | 14 | -20 | -59 |
| Sioux..... | 267 | 292 | 25 | 9 |
| Slope..... | 3 | 0 | -3 | -100 |
| Stark..... | 118 | 204 | 86 | 73 |
| Steele..... | 23 | 16 | -7 | -30 |

186

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits
Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

| State and County | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979 | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984 | Absolute Change | Percent Change |
|------------------|--|--|--------------------|-------------------|
| Stutsman | 309 | 233 | -76 | -25 |
| Towner | 63 | 43 | -20 | -32 |
| Traill | 48 | 49 | 1 | 2 |
| Walsh | 184 | 143 | -41 | -22 |
| Ward | 791 | 607 | -184 | -23 |
| Wells | 55 | 42 | -13 | -24 |
| Williams | 281 | 249 | -32 | -11 |
| Total | 9,187 | 7,551 | -1,636 | -18 |
| Ohio: | | | | |
| Adams | 1,279 | 2,065 | 786 | 61 |
| Allen | 3,172 | 5,146 | 1,974 | 62 |
| Ashland | 518 | 1,032 | 514 | 99 |
| Ashtabula | 2,538 | 4,568 | 2,030 | 80 |
| Athens | 1,763 | 2,448 | 685 | 39 |
| Auglaize | 400 | 1,040 | 640 | 160 |
| Belmont | 1,692 | 3,738 | 2,046 | 121 |
| Brown | 729 | 1,440 | 711 | 98 |
| Butler | 7,305 | 8,678 | 1,373 | 19 |
| Carroll | 416 | 988 | 572 | 138 |
| Champaign | 634 | 1,045 | 411 | 65 |
| Clark | 5,513 | 6,874 | 1,361 | 25 |
| Clermont | 2,434 | 4,291 | 1,857 | 76 |
| Clinton | 676 | 895 | 219 | 32 |
| Columbiana | 2,352 | 4,891 | 2,539 | 108 |
| Coshocton | 562 | 886 | 324 | 58 |
| Crawford | 1,031 | 1,857 | 826 | 80 |
| Cuyahoga | 71,285 | 77,595 | 6,310 | 9 |
| Darke | 705 | 1,475 | 770 | 109 |
| Defiance | 516 | 1,176 | 660 | 128 |
| Delaware | 602 | 845 | 243 | 40 |
| Erie | 1,554 | 2,189 | 635 | 41 |
| Fairfield | 1,161 | 2,159 | 998 | 86 |
| Fayette | 639 | 1,267 | 628 | 98 |
| Franklin | 36,455 | 38,363 | 1,908 | 5 |
| Fulton | 407 | 663 | 256 | 63 |
| Gallia | 853 | 1,774 | 921 | 108 |
| Geauga | 392 | 470 | 78 | 20 |
| Greene | 2,361 | 3,079 | 718 | 30 |
| Guernsey | 706 | 1,812 | 1,106 | 157 |
| Hamilton | 31,145 | 37,729 | 6,584 | 21 |
| Hancock | 704 | 902 | 198 | 28 |
| Hardin | 440 | 1,228 | 788 | 179 |
| Harrison | 293 | 754 | 461 | 157 |
| Henry | 259 | 444 | 185 | 71 |
| Highland | 726 | 1,356 | 630 | 87 |
| Hocking | 714 | 1,311 | 597 | 84 |
| Holmes | 156 | 282 | 126 | 81 |
| Huron | 600 | 1,574 | 974 | 162 |
| Jackson | 1,566 | 1,906 | 340 | 22 |

381 187

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits
Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

| State and County | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979 | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984 | Absolute Change | Percent Change |
|------------------|--|--|--------------------|-------------------|
| Jefferson..... | 2,838 | 4,228 | 1,390 | 49 |
| Knox..... | 809 | 1,186 | 377 | 47 |
| Lake..... | 1,812 | 2,538 | 726 | 40 |
| Lawrence..... | 2,772 | 4,804 | 2,032 | 73 |
| Licking..... | 2,544 | 3,804 | 1,260 | 50 |
| Logan..... | 686 | 1,366 | 680 | 99 |
| Lorain..... | 6,269 | 11,551 | 5,282 | 84 |
| Lucas..... | 19,569 | 24,269 | 4,700 | 24 |
| Madison..... | 683 | 943 | 260 | 38 |
| Mahoning..... | 11,699 | 15,634 | 3,935 | 34 |
| Marion..... | 2,054 | 2,904 | 850 | 41 |
| Medina..... | 507 | 1,360 | 853 | 168 |
| Meigs..... | 773 | 1,493 | 720 | 93 |
| Mercer..... | 406 | 796 | 390 | 96 |
| Miami..... | 1,404 | 2,322 | 918 | 65 |
| Monroe..... | 241 | 626 | 385 | 160 |
| Montgomery..... | 23,574 | 25,899 | 2,325 | 10 |
| Morgan..... | 436 | 733 | 297 | 68 |
| Morrow..... | 496 | 1,021 | 525 | 106 |
| Muskingum..... | 2,184 | 3,283 | 1,099 | 50 |
| Noble..... | 177 | 355 | 178 | 101 |
| Ottawa..... | 582 | 664 | 82 | 14 |
| Paulding..... | 267 | 580 | 313 | 117 |
| Perry..... | 985 | 1,591 | 606 | 62 |
| Pickaway..... | 801 | 1,615 | 814 | 102 |
| Pike..... | 1,011 | 1,870 | 859 | 85 |
| Portage..... | 2,520 | 3,990 | 1,470 | 58 |
| Preble..... | 611 | 1,372 | 761 | 125 |
| Putnam..... | 324 | 565 | 241 | 74 |
| Richland..... | 3,300 | 4,269 | 969 | 29 |
| Ross..... | 2,097 | 2,634 | 537 | 26 |
| Sandusky..... | 950 | 1,567 | 617 | 65 |
| Scioto..... | 4,965 | 6,254 | 1,289 | 26 |
| Seneca..... | 800 | 1,846 | 1,046 | 131 |
| Shelby..... | 703 | 1,731 | 1,028 | 146 |
| Stark..... | 9,034 | 13,593 | 4,559 | 50 |
| Summit..... | 17,761 | 21,549 | 3,788 | 21 |
| Trumbull..... | 6,044 | 9,158 | 3,114 | 52 |
| Tuscarawas..... | 1,694 | 2,586 | 892 | 53 |
| Union..... | 510 | 714 | 204 | 40 |
| Van Wert..... | 300 | 525 | 225 | 75 |
| Vinton..... | 397 | 574 | 177 | 45 |
| Warren..... | 1,724 | 2,254 | 530 | 31 |
| Washington..... | 1,310 | 2,227 | 917 | 70 |
| Wayne..... | 1,092 | 1,786 | 694 | 64 |
| Williams..... | 328 | 718 | 390 | 119 |
| Wood..... | 1,042 | 1,747 | 705 | 68 |
| Wyandot..... | 335 | 294 | -41 | -12 |
| Total..... | 330,673 | 431,623 | 100,950 | 30 |

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits
Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

| State and County | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979 | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984 | Absolute Change | Percent Change |
|------------------|--|--|--------------------|-------------------|
| Oklahoma: | | | | |
| Adair | 1,132 | 772 | -360 | -32 |
| Alfalfa | 58 | 24 | -34 | -59 |
| Atoka | 502 | 510 | 8 | 2 |
| Beaver | 9 | 40 | 31 | 344 |
| Beckham | 297 | 291 | -6 | -2 |
| Blaine | 240 | 231 | -9 | -4 |
| Bryan | 582 | 557 | -25 | -4 |
| Caddo | 1,127 | 816 | -311 | -28 |
| Canadian | 414 | 258 | -156 | -38 |
| Carter | 1,263 | 1,094 | -169 | -13 |
| Cherokee | 988 | 834 | -154 | -16 |
| Choctaw | 827 | 698 | -129 | -16 |
| Cimarron | 26 | 20 | -6 | -23 |
| Cleveland | 718 | 467 | -251 | -35 |
| Coal | 253 | 179 | -74 | -29 |
| Comanche | 2,231 | 2,517 | 286 | 13 |
| Cotton | 145 | 141 | -4 | -3 |
| Craig | 172 | 161 | -11 | -6 |
| Creek | 1,173 | 1,244 | 71 | 6 |
| Custer | 323 | 418 | 95 | 29 |
| Delaware | 769 | 630 | -139 | -18 |
| Dewey | 81 | 8 | -73 | -90 |
| Ellis | 28 | 29 | 1 | 4 |
| Garfield | 676 | 643 | -33 | -5 |
| Garvin | 392 | 527 | 135 | 34 |
| Grady | 547 | 526 | -21 | -4 |
| Grant | 26 | 22 | -4 | -15 |
| Greer | 203 | 140 | -63 | -31 |
| Harmon | 134 | 135 | 1 | 1 |
| Harper | 9 | 0 | -9 | -100 |
| Haskell | 381 | 271 | -110 | -29 |
| Hughes | 338 | 300 | -38 | -11 |
| Jackson | 982 | 751 | -231 | -24 |
| Jefferson | 90 | 19 | -71 | -79 |
| Johnston | 313 | 295 | -18 | -6 |
| Kay | 423 | 474 | 51 | 12 |
| Kingfisher | 82 | 60 | -22 | -27 |
| Kiowa | 321 | 360 | 39 | 12 |
| Latimer | 324 | 274 | -50 | -15 |
| Le Flore | 1,272 | 1,330 | 58 | 5 |
| Lincoln | 392 | 428 | 36 | 9 |
| Logan | 332 | 395 | 63 | 19 |
| Love | 126 | 39 | -87 | -69 |
| Major | 22 | 45 | 23 | 105 |
| Marshall | 250 | 133 | -117 | -47 |
| Mayes | 556 | 530 | -26 | -5 |
| McClain | 226 | 148 | -78 | -35 |
| McCurta:n | 1,827 | 1,591 | -236 | -13 |
| McIntosh | 516 | 345 | -171 | -33 |

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits
Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

| State and County | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979 | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984 | Absolute Change | Percent Change |
|--------------------|--|--|--------------------|-------------------|
| Murray | 202 | 266 | 64 | 32 |
| Muskogee | 2,256 | 2,147 | -109 | -5 |
| Noble | 161 | 196 | 35 | 22 |
| Nowata | 146 | 179 | 33 | 23 |
| Okfuskee | 431 | 296 | -135 | -31 |
| Oklahoma | 14,767 | 12,380 | -2,387 | -16 |
| Okmulgee | 1,480 | 1,332 | -148 | -10 |
| Osage | 577 | 628 | 51 | 9 |
| Ottawa | 660 | 608 | -52 | -8 |
| Pawnee | 211 | 276 | 65 | 31 |
| Payne | 354 | 348 | -6 | -2 |
| Pittsburg | 997 | 789 | -208 | -21 |
| Pontotoc | 496 | 403 | -93 | -19 |
| Pottawatomie | 1,104 | 1,207 | 103 | 9 |
| Pushmataha | 341 | 299 | -42 | -12 |
| Roger Mills | 60 | 90 | 30 | 50 |
| Rogers | 395 | 473 | 78 | 20 |
| Seminole | 1,036 | 971 | -65 | -6 |
| Sequoyah | 981 | 952 | -29 | -3 |
| Stephens | 361 | 528 | 167 | 46 |
| Texas | 93 | 141 | 48 | 52 |
| Tillman | 495 | 347 | -148 | -30 |
| Tulsa | 9,360 | 9,601 | 241 | 3 |
| Wagoner | 844 | 813 | -31 | -4 |
| Washington | 252 | 406 | 154 | 61 |
| Washita | 100 | 112 | 12 | 12 |
| Woods | 79 | 38 | -41 | -52 |
| Woodward | 66 | 91 | 25 | 38 |
| Total | 62,423 | 57,637 | -4,786 | -8 |
| Oregon: | | | | |
| Baker | 423 | 215 | -208 | -49 |
| Benton | 1,087 | 568 | -519 | -48 |
| Clackamas | 4,173 | 1,678 | -2,495 | -60 |
| Clatsop | 755 | 405 | -350 | -46 |
| Columbia | 959 | 533 | -426 | -44 |
| Coos | 2,557 | 1,214 | -1,343 | -53 |
| Crook | 351 | 189 | -162 | -46 |
| Curry | 436 | 260 | -176 | -40 |
| Deschutes | 1,270 | 823 | -447 | -35 |
| Douglas | 3,108 | 1,804 | -1,304 | -42 |
| Gilliam | 97 | 66 | -31 | -32 |
| Grant | 217 | 115 | -102 | -47 |
| Harney | 170 | 115 | -55 | -32 |
| Hood River | 216 | 185 | -31 | -14 |
| Jackson | 4,593 | 2,272 | -2,321 | -51 |
| Jefferson | 279 | 235 | -44 | -16 |
| Josephine | 2,622 | 1,474 | -1,148 | -44 |
| Klamath | 1,669 | 858 | -811 | -49 |
| Lake | 175 | 104 | -71 | -41 |

199 190

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits
Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

| State and County | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979 | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984 | Absolute Change | Percent Change |
|------------------|--|--|--------------------|-------------------|
| Lane | 9,927 | 6,715 | -3,212 | -32 |
| Lincoln | 900 | 681 | -219 | -24 |
| Linn | 3,469 | 2,115 | -1,354 | -39 |
| Malheur | 1,033 | 415 | -618 | -60 |
| Marion | 5,961 | 4,110 | -1,851 | -31 |
| Morrow | 150 | 0 | -150 | -100 |
| Multnomah | 21,004 | 12,667 | -8,337 | -40 |
| Polk | 1,072 | 584 | -488 | -46 |
| Sherman | 6 | 0 | 0 | . |
| Tillamook | 562 | 311 | -251 | -45 |
| Umatilla | 1,351 | 1,139 | -212 | -16 |
| Union | 554 | 366 | -188 | -34 |
| Wallowa | 136 | 85 | -51 | -38 |
| Wasco | 448 | 370 | -78 | -17 |
| Washington | 3,747 | 2,296 | -1,451 | -39 |
| Wheeler | 0 | 0 | 0 | . |
| Yamhill | 1,472 | 971 | -501 | -34 |
| Total | 76,943 | 45,938 | -31,005 | -40 |
| Pennsylvania: | | | | |
| Adams | 815 | 551 | -264 | -32 |
| Allegheny | 51,730 | 47,403 | -4,327 | -8 |
| Armstrong | 1,706 | 2,361 | 655 | 38 |
| Beaver | 4,095 | 6,943 | 2,848 | 70 |
| Bedford | 1,024 | 1,233 | 209 | 20 |
| Berks | 6,054 | 5,735 | -319 | -5 |
| Blair | 3,527 | 4,293 | 766 | 22 |
| Bradford | 2,482 | 2,097 | -385 | -16 |
| Bucks | 8,306 | 5,414 | -2,892 | -35 |
| Butler | 2,541 | 3,068 | 527 | 21 |
| Cambria | 3,068 | 5,337 | 2,269 | 74 |
| Cameron | 166 | 205 | 39 | 23 |
| Carbon | 693 | 819 | 126 | 18 |
| Centre | 1,398 | 1,270 | -128 | -9 |
| Chester | 6,430 | 4,829 | -1,601 | -25 |
| Clarion | 804 | 1,122 | 318 | 40 |
| Clearfield | 1,872 | 2,209 | 337 | 18 |
| Clinton | 1,107 | 1,463 | 356 | 32 |
| Columbia | 1,237 | 1,086 | -151 | -12 |
| Crawford | 2,275 | 3,115 | 840 | 37 |
| Cumberland | 1,041 | 962 | -79 | -8 |
| Dauphin | 8,193 | 6,958 | -1,235 | -15 |
| Delaware | 15,415 | 11,703 | -3,712 | -24 |
| Elk | 597 | 721 | 124 | 21 |
| Erie | 9,443 | 10,688 | 1,245 | 13 |
| Fayette | 8,385 | 9,457 | 1,072 | 13 |
| Forest | 104 | 142 | 38 | 37 |
| Franklin | 1,298 | 1,623 | 325 | 25 |
| Fulton | 324 | 264 | -60 | -19 |
| Greene | 1,477 | 1,959 | 482 | 33 |

191

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits
Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

| State and County | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979 | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984 | Absolute Change | Percent Change |
|---------------------|--|--|--------------------|-------------------|
| Huntingdon..... | 1,246 | 976 | -264 | -21 |
| Indiana..... | 1,603 | 2,019 | 416 | 26 |
| Jefferson..... | 659 | 624 | -35 | -5 |
| Juniata..... | 323 | 232 | -41 | -13 |
| Lackawanna..... | 5,688 | 5,757 | 69 | 1 |
| Lancaster..... | 5,761 | 5,984 | 223 | 4 |
| Lawrence..... | 3,118 | 3,913 | 795 | 25 |
| Lebanon..... | 1,365 | 1,260 | -105 | -8 |
| Lehigh..... | 4,633 | 4,582 | -51 | -1 |
| Luzerne..... | 8,566 | 8,391 | -175 | -2 |
| Lycoming..... | 3,376 | 909 | -2,467 | -73 |
| McKean..... | 1,618 | 1,685 | 67 | 4 |
| Mercer..... | 2,815 | 4,196 | 1,381 | 49 |
| Mifflin..... | 1,364 | 1,224 | -140 | -10 |
| Monroe..... | 1,119 | 1,079 | -40 | -4 |
| Montgomery..... | 6,866 | 5,478 | -1,388 | -20 |
| Montour..... | 225 | 207 | -1 | -8 |
| Northampton..... | 4,467 | 3,959 | -508 | -11 |
| Northumberland..... | 1,872 | 1,945 | 73 | 4 |
| Perry..... | 615 | 694 | 79 | 13 |
| Philadelphia..... | 176,490 | 147,673 | -28,817 | -16 |
| Pike..... | 196 | 171 | -25 | -13 |
| Potter..... | 645 | 626 | -19 | -3 |
| Schuylkill..... | 2,670 | 2,482 | -188 | -7 |
| Snyder..... | 388 | 461 | 73 | 19 |
| Somerset..... | 1,813 | 2,295 | 482 | 27 |
| Sullivan..... | 59 | 78 | 19 | 32 |
| Susquehanna..... | 894 | 799 | -95 | -11 |
| Tioga..... | 1,104 | 976 | -128 | -12 |
| Union..... | 334 | 467 | 133 | 40 |
| Venango..... | 1,773 | 2,064 | 291 | 16 |
| Warren..... | 878 | 1,014 | 136 | 15 |
| Washington..... | 5,449 | 6,617 | 1,168 | 21 |
| Wayne..... | 698 | 629 | -69 | -10 |
| Westmoreland..... | 8,083 | 9,457 | 1,374 | 17 |
| Wyoming..... | 804 | 847 | 43 | 5 |
| York..... | 4,942 | 4,717 | -225 | -5 |
| Total..... | 412,120 | 381,567 | -30,553 | -7 |
| Rhode Island: | | | | |
| Bristol..... | 775 | 496 | -279 | -36 |
| Kent..... | 3,899 | 2,949 | -950 | -24 |
| Newport..... | 2,308 | 1,530 | -778 | -34 |
| Providence..... | 25,418 | 22,745 | -2,673 | -11 |
| Washington..... | 2,047 | 1,777 | -270 | -13 |
| Total..... | 34,447 | 29,497 | -4,950 | -14 |
| South Carolina: | | | | |
| Abbeville..... | 761 | 611 | -150 | -20 |
| Aiken..... | 2,956 | 2,145 | -811 | -27 |

192

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change in Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits
Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

| State and County | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979 | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984 | Absolute Change | Percent Change |
|-------------------|--|--|--------------------|-------------------|
| Allendale..... | 1,181 | 1,100 | -81 | -7 |
| Anderson..... | 1,882 | 2,110 | 228 | 12 |
| Bamberg..... | 1,528 | 1,051 | -477 | -31 |
| Barnwell..... | 1,419 | 1,089 | -330 | -23 |
| Beaufort..... | 2,588 | 1,845 | -743 | -29 |
| Berkeley..... | 2,406 | 1,904 | -502 | -21 |
| Calhoun..... | 804 | 480 | -324 | -40 |
| Charleston..... | 11,222 | 8,704 | -2,518 | -22 |
| Cherokee..... | 983 | 1,124 | 141 | 14 |
| Chester..... | 885 | 1,030 | 145 | 16 |
| Chesterfield..... | 1,327 | 1,225 | -102 | -8 |
| Clarendon..... | 2,038 | 1,680 | -358 | -18 |
| Colleton..... | 1,888 | 1,722 | -166 | -9 |
| Darlington..... | 3,677 | 2,549 | -1,128 | -31 |
| Dillon..... | 2,029 | 1,716 | -313 | -15 |
| Dorchester..... | 1,566 | 1,540 | -26 | -2 |
| Edgefield..... | 731 | 636 | -95 | -13 |
| Fairfield..... | 1,054 | 960 | -94 | -9 |
| Florence..... | 5,081 | 4,338 | -743 | -15 |
| Georgetown..... | 2,337 | 1,556 | -781 | -33 |
| Greenville..... | 4,855 | 4,641 | -214 | -4 |
| Greenwood..... | 1,333 | 1,324 | -9 | -1 |
| Hampton..... | 1,547 | 1,067 | -480 | -31 |
| Horry..... | 3,732 | 2,743 | -989 | -27 |
| Jasper..... | 1,219 | 809 | -410 | -34 |
| Kershaw..... | 1,111 | 889 | -222 | -20 |
| Lancaster..... | 953 | 1,176 | 223 | 23 |
| Laurens..... | 1,168 | 1,259 | 91 | 8 |
| Lee..... | 1,501 | 1,195 | -306 | -20 |
| Lexington..... | 1,600 | 1,484 | -116 | -7 |
| Marion..... | 1,719 | 1,908 | 189 | 11 |
| Marlboro..... | 577 | 1,313 | 736 | 128 |
| McCormick..... | 2,125 | 329 | -1,796 | -85 |
| Newberry..... | 857 | 800 | -57 | -7 |
| Oconee..... | 370 | 359 | -11 | -3 |
| Orangeburg..... | 5,777 | 5,218 | -559 | -10 |
| Pickens..... | 684 | 694 | 10 | 1 |
| Richland..... | 7,977 | 7,288 | -689 | -9 |
| Saluda..... | 573 | 266 | -307 | -54 |
| Spartanburg..... | 3,344 | 3,874 | 530 | 16 |
| Sumter..... | 4,661 | 3,989 | -672 | -14 |
| Union..... | 537 | 900 | 363 | 68 |
| Williamsburg..... | 2,691 | 2,634 | -57 | -2 |
| York..... | 1,944 | 2,132 | 188 | 10 |
| Total..... | 103,198 | 89,406 | -13,792 | -13 |
| South Dakota: | | | | |
| Aurora..... | 29 | 9 | -20 | -69 |
| Beadle..... | 287 | 173 | -114 | -40 |
| Bennett..... | 227 | 188 | -39 | -17 |

201
193

TABLE F-1 —Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits
Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

| State and County | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979 | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984 | Absolute Change | Percent Change |
|------------------|--|--|--------------------|-------------------|
| Bon Homme..... | 83 | 37 | -46 | -55 |
| Brookings..... | 151 | 160 | 9 | 6 |
| Brown..... | 523 | 372 | -151 | -29 |
| Brule..... | 82 | 58 | -24 | -29 |
| Buffalo..... | 172 | 183 | 11 | 6 |
| Butte..... | 188 | 123 | -65 | -35 |
| Campbell..... | 4 | 3 | -1 | -25 |
| Charles Mix..... | 365 | 256 | -109 | -30 |
| Clark..... | 24 | 14 | -10 | -42 |
| Clay..... | 151 | 156 | 5 | 3 |
| Codington..... | 267 | 195 | -72 | -27 |
| Corson..... | 340 | 325 | -15 | -4 |
| Custer..... | 71 | 66 | -5 | -7 |
| Davison..... | 329 | 259 | -70 | -21 |
| Day..... | 95 | 90 | -5 | -5 |
| Deuel..... | 25 | 17 | -8 | -32 |
| Dewey..... | 368 | 452 | 84 | 23 |
| Douglas..... | 30 | 23 | -7 | -23 |
| Edmunds..... | 41 | 12 | -29 | -71 |
| Fall River..... | 183 | 175 | -8 | -4 |
| Faulk..... | 16 | 5 | -11 | -69 |
| Grant..... | 69 | 49 | -20 | -29 |
| Gregory..... | 124 | 118 | -6 | -5 |
| Haakon..... | 24 | 13 | -11 | -46 |
| Hamlin..... | 31 | 21 | -10 | -32 |
| Hand..... | 19 | 3 | -16 | -84 |
| Hanson..... | 21 | 10 | -11 | -52 |
| Harding..... | 4 | 3 | -1 | -25 |
| Hughes..... | 310 | 205 | -105 | -34 |
| Hutchinson..... | 43 | 25 | -18 | -42 |
| Hyde..... | 33 | 7 | -26 | -79 |
| Jackson..... | 190 | 17 | -173 | -91 |
| Jerauld..... | 17 | 13 | -4 | -24 |
| Jones..... | 22 | 9 | -13 | -59 |
| Kingsbury..... | 52 | 24 | -28 | -54 |
| Lake..... | 109 | 109 | 0 | 0 |
| Lawrence..... | 298 | 283 | -15 | -5 |
| Lincoln..... | 121 | 99 | -22 | -18 |
| Lyman..... | 134 | 112 | -22 | -16 |
| Marshall..... | 70 | 37 | -33 | -47 |
| McCook..... | 78 | 43 | -35 | -45 |
| McPherson..... | 27 | 6 | -21 | -78 |
| Meade..... | 232 | 177 | -55 | -24 |
| Mellette..... | 206 | 159 | -47 | -23 |
| Miner..... | 25 | 11 | -14 | -56 |
| Minnehaha..... | 1,609 | 1,196 | -413 | -26 |
| Moody..... | 78 | 44 | -34 | -44 |
| Pennington..... | 2,027 | 1,838 | -189 | -9 |
| Perkins..... | 43 | 28 | -15 | -35 |
| Potter..... | 30 | 6 | -24 | -80 |

194

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits
Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

| State and County | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979 | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984 | Absolute Change | Percent Change |
|------------------|--|--|--------------------|-------------------|
| Roberts | 336 | 274 | -62 | -18 |
| Sanborn | 35 | 17 | -18 | -51 |
| Shannon | 1,981 | 1,284 | -697 | -35 |
| Spink | 91 | 66 | -25 | -27 |
| Stanley | 65 | 10 | -55 | -85 |
| Sully | 10 | 4 | -6 | -60 |
| Todd | 1,033 | 836 | -197 | -19 |
| Tripp | 212 | 209 | -3 | -1 |
| Turner | 71 | 31 | -40 | -56 |
| Union | 113 | 100 | -13 | -11 |
| Walworth | 151 | 144 | -7 | -5 |
| Yankton | 282 | 176 | -106 | -38 |
| Ziebach | 236 | 177 | -59 | -25 |
| Total | 14,721 | 11,350 | -3,371 | -23 |
| Tennessee: | | | | |
| Anderson | 1,385 | 1,198 | -187 | -14 |
| Bedford | 379 | 413 | 34 | 9 |
| Benton | 209 | 203 | -6 | -3 |
| Bledsoe | 198 | 162 | -36 | -18 |
| Blount | 1,116 | 993 | -123 | -11 |
| Bradley | 709 | 539 | -170 | -24 |
| Campbell | 1,040 | 1,132 | 92 | 9 |
| Cannon | 75 | 115 | 40 | 53 |
| Carroll | 504 | 403 | -101 | -20 |
| Carter | 836 | 742 | -94 | -11 |
| Cheatham | 231 | 235 | 4 | 2 |
| Chester | 239 | 186 | -53 | -22 |
| Claiborne | 638 | 560 | -78 | -12 |
| Clay | 213 | 147 | -66 | -31 |
| Cocke | 864 | 1,032 | 168 | 19 |
| Coffee | 380 | 422 | 42 | 11 |
| Crockett | 448 | 343 | -105 | -23 |
| Cumberland | 500 | 457 | -43 | -9 |
| Davidson | 11,778 | 11,819 | 41 | 0 |
| De Kalb | 178 | 163 | -15 | -8 |
| Decatur | 109 | 91 | -18 | -17 |
| Dickson | 361 | 434 | 73 | 20 |
| Dyer | 796 | 794 | -2 | -0 |
| Fayette | 1,654 | 1,322 | -332 | -20 |
| Fentress | 260 | 352 | 92 | 35 |
| Franklin | 533 | 486 | -47 | -9 |
| Gibson | 1,231 | 925 | -306 | -25 |
| Giles | 382 | 415 | 33 | 9 |
| Grainger | 311 | 260 | -51 | -16 |
| Greene | 674 | 707 | 33 | 5 |
| Grundy | 312 | 462 | 150 | 48 |
| Hamblen | 788 | 867 | 79 | 10 |
| Hamilton | 7,218 | 6,786 | -432 | -6 |
| Hancock | 364 | 328 | -36 | -10 |

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits
Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

| State and County | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979 | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984 | Absolute Change | Percent Change |
|------------------|--|--|--------------------|-------------------|
| Hardeman..... | 1,428 | 1,156 | -272 | -19 |
| Hardin..... | 425 | 317 | -108 | -25 |
| Hawkins..... | 542 | 548 | 6 | 1 |
| Haywood..... | 1,202 | 1,022 | -180 | -15 |
| Henderson..... | 303 | 221 | -82 | -27 |
| Henry..... | 369 | 409 | 40 | 11 |
| Hickman..... | 244 | 210 | -34 | -14 |
| Houston..... | 164 | 153 | -11 | -7 |
| Humphreys..... | 242 | 250 | 8 | 3 |
| Jackson..... | 129 | 124 | -5 | -4 |
| Jefferson..... | 466 | 474 | 8 | 2 |
| Johnson..... | 339 | 377 | 38 | 11 |
| Knox..... | 6,915 | 5,998 | -917 | -13 |
| Lake..... | 458 | 296 | -162 | -35 |
| Lauderdale..... | 1,030 | 925 | -105 | -10 |
| Lawrence..... | 315 | 371 | 56 | 18 |
| Lewis..... | 119 | 135 | 16 | 13 |
| Lincoln..... | 369 | 292 | -77 | -21 |
| Loudon..... | 333 | 324 | -9 | -3 |
| Macon..... | 144 | 166 | 22 | 15 |
| Madison..... | 2,446 | 2,059 | -387 | -16 |
| Marion..... | 541 | 535 | -6 | -1 |
| Marshall..... | 268 | 239 | -29 | -11 |
| Maury..... | 873 | 1,012 | 139 | 16 |
| McMinn..... | 410 | 562 | 152 | 37 |
| McNairy..... | 361 | 385 | 24 | 7 |
| Meigs..... | 122 | 81 | -41 | -34 |
| Monroe..... | 542 | 471 | -71 | -13 |
| Montgomery..... | 1,150 | 901 | -249 | -22 |
| Moore..... | 18 | 36 | 18 | 100 |
| Morgan..... | 536 | 461 | -75 | -14 |
| Obion..... | 524 | 477 | -47 | -9 |
| Overton..... | 254 | 222 | -32 | -13 |
| Perry..... | 88 | 77 | -11 | -13 |
| Pickett..... | 93 | 50 | -43 | -46 |
| Polk..... | 206 | 144 | -62 | -30 |
| Putnam..... | 350 | 362 | 12 | 3 |
| Rhea..... | 552 | 576 | 24 | 4 |
| Roane..... | 884 | 765 | -119 | -13 |
| Robertson..... | 714 | 582 | -132 | -18 |
| Rutherford..... | 979 | 820 | -159 | -16 |
| Scott..... | 903 | 731 | -172 | -19 |
| Sequatchie..... | 234 | 202 | -32 | -14 |
| Sevier..... | 472 | 537 | 65 | 14 |
| Shelby..... | 39,932 | 35,451 | -4,481 | -11 |
| Smith..... | 134 | 150 | 16 | 12 |
| Stewart..... | 121 | 94 | -27 | -22 |
| Sullivan..... | 1,811 | 1,429 | -382 | -21 |
| Sumner..... | 943 | 853 | -90 | -10 |
| Tipton..... | 1,333 | 1,136 | -197 | -15 |

196

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits
Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

| State and County | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979 | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984 | Absolute Change | Per- cent Change |
|------------------|--|--|--------------------|------------------------|
| Trousdale | 76 | 70 | -6 | -8 |
| Unicoi | 254 | 239 | -15 | -6 |
| Union | 336 | 312 | -24 | -7 |
| Van Buren | 45 | 54 | 9 | 20 |
| Warren | 340 | 323 | -17 | -5 |
| Washington | 1,070 | 1,140 | 70 | 7 |
| Wayne | 165 | 105 | -60 | -36 |
| Weakley | 334 | 309 | -25 | -7 |
| White | 185 | 198 | 13 | 7 |
| Williamson | 918 | 650 | -268 | -29 |
| Wilson | 642 | 616 | -26 | -4 |
| Total | 114,608 | 104,677 | -9,931 | -9 |
| Texas: | | | | |
| Anderson | 515 | 480 | -35 | -7 |
| Andrews | 38 | 36 | -2 | -5 |
| Angelina | 661 | 957 | 296 | 45 |
| Aransas | 141 | 215 | 74 | 52 |
| Archer | 12 | 15 | 3 | 25 |
| Armstrong | 0 | 1 | 1 | . |
| Atascosa | 693 | 578 | -115 | -17 |
| Austin | 203 | 264 | 61 | 30 |
| Bailey | 85 | 107 | 22 | 26 |
| Bandera | 32 | 25 | -7 | -22 |
| Bastrop | 358 | 454 | 96 | 27 |
| Baylor | 31 | 23 | -8 | -26 |
| Bee | 717 | 700 | -17 | -2 |
| Bell | 1,618 | 2,471 | 853 | 53 |
| Bexar | 27,535 | 25,577 | -1,958 | -7 |
| Blanco | 10 | 8 | -2 | -20 |
| Borden | 2 | 0 | -2 | -100 |
| Bosque | 72 | 66 | -6 | -8 |
| Bowie | 2,184 | 2,142 | -42 | -2 |
| Brazoria | 758 | 763 | 5 | 1 |
| Brazos | 821 | 774 | -47 | -6 |
| Brewster | 98 | 68 | -30 | -31 |
| Briscoe | 36 | 26 | -10 | -28 |
| Brooks | 338 | 351 | 13 | 4 |
| Brown | 181 | 420 | 239 | 132 |
| Burleson | 353 | 314 | -39 | -11 |
| Burnet | 169 | 167 | -2 | -1 |
| Caldwell | 492 | 481 | -11 | -2 |
| Calhoun | 388 | 312 | -76 | -20 |
| Callahan | 34 | 53 | 19 | 56 |
| Cameron | 7,571 | 8,450 | 879 | 12 |
| Camp | 171 | 220 | 49 | 29 |
| Carson | 5 | 21 | 16 | 320 |
| Cass | 593 | 720 | 127 | 21 |
| Castro | 102 | 209 | 107 | 105 |
| Chambers | 252 | 311 | 59 | 23 |

384
197

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits
Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

| State and County | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979 | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984 | Absolute Change | Percent Change |
|---------------------|--|--|--------------------|-------------------|
| Cherokee | 486 | 586 | 100 | 21 |
| Childress | 52 | 86 | 34 | 65 |
| Clay | 33 | 38 | 5 | 15 |
| Cochran | 80 | 69 | -11 | -14 |
| Coke | 5 | 22 | 17 | 340 |
| Coleman | 167 | 147 | -20 | -12 |
| Collin | 656 | 828 | 172 | 26 |
| Collingsworth | 56 | 36 | -20 | -36 |
| Colorado | 360 | 325 | -35 | -10 |
| Comal | 196 | 316 | 120 | 61 |
| Comanche | 101 | 63 | -38 | -38 |
| Concho | 18 | 19 | 1 | 6 |
| Cooke | 143 | 164 | 21 | 15 |
| Coryell | 199 | 363 | 164 | 82 |
| Cottle | 51 | 45 | -6 | -12 |
| Crane | 18 | 12 | -6 | -33 |
| Crockett | 28 | 45 | 17 | 61 |
| Crosby | 78 | 147 | 69 | 88 |
| Culberson | 25 | 31 | 9 | 36 |
| Dallam | 38 | 20 | -18 | -47 |
| Dallas | 20,136 | 21,157 | 1,021 | 5 |
| Dawson | 355 | 313 | -42 | -12 |
| De Witt | 422 | 374 | -48 | -11 |
| Deaf Smith | 424 | 358 | -66 | -16 |
| Delta | 135 | 58 | -77 | -57 |
| Denton | 458 | 490 | 32 | 7 |
| Dickens | 55 | 75 | 20 | 36 |
| Dimmit | 588 | 491 | -97 | -16 |
| Donley | 28 | 53 | 25 | 89 |
| Duval | 480 | 491 | 11 | 2 |
| Eastland | 109 | 78 | -31 | -28 |
| Ector | 679 | 1,213 | 539 | 79 |
| Edwards | 50 | 50 | 0 | 0 |
| El Paso | 8,022 | 9,393 | 1,371 | 17 |
| Ellis | 894 | 698 | -196 | -22 |
| Erath | 46 | 84 | 38 | 83 |
| Falls | 417 | 430 | 13 | 3 |
| Fannin | 371 | 298 | -73 | -20 |
| Fayette | 156 | 160 | 4 | 3 |
| Fisher | 86 | 54 | -32 | -37 |
| Floyd | 161 | 198 | 37 | 23 |
| Foard | 41 | 25 | -16 | -39 |
| Fort Bend | 1,120 | 976 | -144 | -13 |
| Franklin | 8 | 23 | 15 | 188 |
| Freestone | 203 | 217 | 14 | 7 |
| Frio | 671 | 744 | 73 | 11 |
| Gaines | 126 | 102 | -24 | -19 |
| Galveston | 2,389 | 2,888 | 499 | 21 |
| Garza | 101 | 122 | 21 | 21 |
| Gillespie | 72 | 69 | -3 | -4 |

198

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits
Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

| State and County | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979 | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984 | Absolute Change | Percent Change |
|------------------|--|--|--------------------|-------------------|
| Glasscock..... | 11 | 14 | 3 | 27 |
| Goliad..... | 95 | 96 | 1 | 1 |
| Gonzales..... | 414 | 455 | 41 | 10 |
| Gray..... | 111 | 123 | 12 | 11 |
| Grayson..... | 615 | 787 | 172 | 28 |
| Gregg..... | 1,507 | 1,672 | 165 | 11 |
| Grimes..... | 411 | 451 | 40 | 10 |
| Guadalupe..... | 475 | 547 | 72 | 15 |
| Hale..... | 533 | 663 | 130 | 24 |
| Hall..... | 99 | 98 | -1 | -1 |
| Hamilton..... | 33 | 31 | -2 | -6 |
| Hansford..... | 20 | 7 | -13 | -65 |
| Hardeman..... | 100 | 74 | -26 | -26 |
| Hardin..... | 586 | 711 | 125 | 21 |
| Harris..... | 29,577 | 46,189 | 16,612 | 56 |
| Harrison..... | 1,784 | 1,555 | -229 | -13 |
| Hartley..... | 5 | 2 | -3 | -60 |
| Haskell..... | 138 | 83 | -55 | -40 |
| Hays..... | 438 | 607 | 169 | 39 |
| Hemphill..... | 6 | 7 | 1 | 17 |
| Henderson..... | 485 | 569 | 84 | 17 |
| Hidalgo..... | 11,330 | 12,779 | 1,449 | 13 |
| Hill..... | 360 | 422 | 62 | 17 |
| Hockley..... | 279 | 280 | 1 | 0 |
| Hood..... | 49 | 79 | 30 | 61 |
| Hopkins..... | 257 | 160 | -97 | -38 |
| Houston..... | 610 | 637 | 27 | 4 |
| Howard..... | 489 | 587 | 98 | 20 |
| Hudspeth..... | 18 | 73 | 55 | 306 |
| Hunt..... | 718 | 845 | 127 | 18 |
| Hutchinson..... | 74 | 55 | -19 | -26 |
| Irion..... | 10 | 2 | -8 | -80 |
| Jack..... | 11 | 24 | 13 | 118 |
| Jackson..... | 371 | 315 | -56 | -15 |
| Jasper..... | 681 | 765 | 84 | 12 |
| Jeff Davis..... | 31 | 6 | -25 | -81 |
| Jefferson..... | 3,840 | 5,130 | 1,290 | 34 |
| Jim Hogg..... | 118 | 105 | -13 | -11 |
| Jim Wells..... | 1,171 | 1,106 | -65 | -6 |
| Johnson..... | 478 | 524 | 46 | 10 |
| Jones..... | 277 | 240 | -37 | -13 |
| Karnes..... | 400 | 389 | -11 | -3 |
| Kaufman..... | 621 | 594 | -27 | -4 |
| Kendall..... | 66 | 27 | -39 | -59 |
| Kenedy..... | 4 | 3 | -1 | -25 |
| Kent..... | 1 | 8 | 7 | 700 |
| Kerr..... | 299 | 344 | 45 | 15 |
| Kimble..... | 46 | 26 | -20 | -43 |
| King..... | 0 | 3 | 3 | . |
| Kinney..... | 58 | 55 | -3 | -5 |

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits
Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

| State and County | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979 | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984 | Absolute Change | Percent Change |
|-------------------|--|--|--------------------|-------------------|
| Kleberg | 993 | 1,042 | 49 | 5 |
| Knox | 133 | 102 | -31 | -23 |
| La Salle | 276 | 266 | -10 | -4 |
| Lamar | 1,163 | 940 | -223 | -19 |
| Lamb | 313 | 310 | -3 | -1 |
| Lampasas | 95 | 163 | 68 | 72 |
| Lavaca | 171 | 206 | 35 | 20 |
| Lee | 123 | 82 | -41 | -33 |
| Leon | 194 | 131 | -63 | -32 |
| Liberty | 683 | 906 | 223 | 33 |
| Limestone | 454 | 307 | -147 | -32 |
| Lipscomb | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| Live Oak | 90 | 107 | 17 | 19 |
| Llano | 27 | 20 | -7 | -26 |
| Lubbock | 1,715 | 2,394 | 679 | 40 |
| Lynn | 132 | 167 | 35 | 27 |
| Madison | 192 | 192 | 0 | 0 |
| Marion | 331 | 365 | 34 | 10 |
| Martin | 63 | 101 | 38 | 60 |
| Mason | 9 | 7 | -2 | -22 |
| Matagorda | 494 | 559 | 65 | 13 |
| Maverick | 945 | 1,306 | 361 | 38 |
| McCulloch | 132 | 97 | -35 | -27 |
| McLennan | 2,993 | 3,108 | 115 | 4 |
| McMullen | 9 | 1 | -8 | -89 |
| Medina | 414 | 431 | 17 | 4 |
| Menard | 16 | 31 | 15 | 94 |
| Midland | 879 | 768 | -111 | -13 |
| Milam | 481 | 465 | -16 | -3 |
| Mills | 15 | 5 | -10 | -67 |
| Mitchell | 107 | 97 | -10 | -9 |
| Montague | 78 | 64 | -14 | -18 |
| Montgomery | 808 | 807 | -1 | -0 |
| Moore | 82 | 85 | 3 | 4 |
| Morris | 402 | 350 | -52 | -13 |
| Motley | 15 | 14 | -1 | -7 |
| Nacogdoches | 514 | 710 | 196 | 38 |
| Navarro | 589 | 581 | -8 | -1 |
| Newton | 311 | 408 | 97 | 31 |
| Nolan | 179 | 208 | 29 | 16 |
| Nueces | 6,815 | 6,132 | -683 | -10 |
| Ochiltree | 22 | 32 | 10 | 45 |
| Oldham | 5 | 2 | -3 | -60 |
| Orange | 867 | 1,113 | 246 | 28 |
| Palo Pinto | 166 | 282 | 116 | 70 |
| Panola | 306 | 348 | 42 | 14 |
| Parker | 165 | 234 | 69 | 42 |
| Parmer | 54 | 107 | 53 | 98 |
| Pecos | 129 | 147 | 18 | 14 |
| Polk | 486 | 508 | 22 | 5 |

200

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits
Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

| State and County | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979 | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984 | Absolute Change | Percent Change |
|---------------------|--|--|--------------------|-------------------|
| Potter | 766 | 1,001 | 235 | 31 |
| Presidio | 54 | 82 | 28 | 52 |
| Rains | 35 | 23 | -12 | -34 |
| Randall | 39 | 64 | 25 | 64 |
| Reagar | 16 | 28 | 12 | 75 |
| Real | 55 | 38 | -17 | -31 |
| Red River | 433 | 358 | -75 | -17 |
| Reeves | 242 | 266 | 24 | 10 |
| Refugio | 231 | 220 | -11 | -5 |
| Roberts | 3 | 0 | -3 | -100 |
| Robertson | 731 | 718 | -13 | -2 |
| Rockwall | 88 | 19 | -69 | -78 |
| Runnels | 103 | 114 | 11 | 11 |
| Rusk | 709 | 748 | 39 | 6 |
| Sabine | 167 | 166 | -1 | -1 |
| San Augustine | 263 | 292 | 29 | 11 |
| San Jacinto | 350 | 356 | 6 | 2 |
| San Patricio | 1,411 | 1,610 | 199 | 14 |
| San Saba | 59 | 54 | -5 | -8 |
| Schleicher | 13 | 18 | 5 | 38 |
| Scurry | 185 | 119 | -66 | -36 |
| Shackelford | 31 | 16 | -15 | -48 |
| Shelby | 582 | 605 | 23 | 4 |
| Sherman | 8 | 0 | -8 | -100 |
| Smith | 1,819 | 2,061 | 242 | 13 |
| Somervell | 20 | 20 | 0 | 0 |
| Starr | 917 | 1,145 | 228 | 25 |
| Stephens | 71 | 68 | -3 | -4 |
| Sterling | 0 | 6 | 6 | . |
| Stonewall | 13 | 2 | -11 | -85 |
| Sutton | 14 | 12 | -2 | -14 |
| Swisher | 106 | 167 | 61 | 58 |
| Tarrant | 7,875 | 7,696 | -179 | -2 |
| Taylor | 767 | 572 | -195 | -25 |
| Terrell | 8 | 4 | -4 | -50 |
| Terry | 384 | 362 | -22 | -6 |
| Throckmorton | 22 | 13 | -9 | -41 |
| Titus | 155 | 359 | 204 | 132 |
| Tom Green | 890 | 745 | -145 | -16 |
| Travis | 4,290 | 5,347 | 1,057 | 25 |
| Trinity | 284 | 269 | -15 | -5 |
| Tyler | 218 | 241 | 23 | 11 |
| Upshur | 525 | 449 | -76 | -14 |
| Upton | 29 | 28 | -1 | -3 |
| Uvalde | 682 | 539 | -143 | -21 |
| Val Verde | 791 | 990 | 199 | 25 |
| Van Zandt | 267 | 229 | -38 | -14 |
| Victoria | 1,152 | 1,071 | -81 | -7 |
| Walker | 649 | 712 | 63 | 10 |
| Waller | 425 | 473 | 48 | 11 |

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits
Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

| State and County | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979 | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984 | Absolute Change | Percent Change |
|------------------|--|--|--------------------|-------------------|
| Ward | 96 | 73 | -23 | -24 |
| Washington | 489 | 391 | -98 | -20 |
| Webb | 2,935 | 3,421 | 486 | 17 |
| Wharton | 657 | 644 | -13 | -2 |
| Wheeler | 54 | 51 | -3 | -6 |
| Wichita | 1,068 | 1,099 | 31 | 3 |
| Wilbarger | 178 | 85 | -93 | -52 |
| Willacy | 676 | 701 | 25 | 4 |
| Williamson | 705 | 635 | -70 | -10 |
| Wilson | 341 | 186 | -155 | -45 |
| Winkler | 51 | 50 | -1 | -2 |
| Wise | 121 | 142 | 21 | 17 |
| Wood | 198 | 211 | 13 | 7 |
| Yoakum | 63 | 62 | -1 | -2 |
| Young | 72 | 90 | 18 | 25 |
| Zapata | 198 | 226 | 28 | 14 |
| Zavala | 744 | 613 | -131 | -18 |
| Total | 212,205 | 239,143 | 26,938 | 13 |
| Utah: | | | | |
| Beaver | 70 | 45 | -25 | -36 |
| Box Elder | 429 | 364 | -65 | -15 |
| Cache | 388 | 418 | 30 | 8 |
| Carbon | 472 | 442 | -30 | -6 |
| Daggett | 10 | 1 | -9 | -90 |
| Davis | 1,397 | 1,541 | 144 | 10 |
| Duchesne | 181 | 182 | 1 | 1 |
| Emery | 124 | 132 | 8 | 6 |
| Garfield | 28 | 18 | -10 | -36 |
| Grand | 150 | 218 | 68 | 45 |
| Iron | 165 | 264 | 99 | 60 |
| Juab | 90 | 67 | -23 | -26 |
| Kane | 21 | 31 | 10 | 48 |
| Millard | 123 | 96 | -27 | -22 |
| Morgan | 21 | 19 | -2 | -10 |
| Piute | 23 | 14 | -9 | -39 |
| Rich | 6 | 13 | 7 | 117 |
| Salt Lake | 13,113 | 11,534 | -1,579 | -12 |
| San Juan | 1,351 | 584 | -767 | -57 |
| Sanpete | 232 | 146 | -86 | -37 |
| Sevier | 307 | 249 | -58 | -19 |
| Summit | 74 | 52 | -22 | -30 |
| Tooele | 408 | 490 | 82 | 20 |
| Uintah | 178 | 284 | 106 | 60 |
| Utah | 3,293 | 3,124 | -169 | -5 |
| Wasatch | 125 | 78 | -47 | -38 |
| Washington | 305 | 319 | 14 | 5 |
| Wayne | 23 | 3 | -20 | -87 |
| Weber | 3,445 | 3,772 | 327 | 9 |
| Total | 26,552 | 24,500 | -2,052 | -8 |

202

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits
Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

| State and County | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979 | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984 | Absolute Change | Percent Change |
|-----------------------|--|--|--------------------|-------------------|
| Vermont: | | | | |
| Addison..... | 623 | 813 | 190 | 30 |
| Bennington..... | 868 | 1,035 | 167 | 19 |
| Caledonia..... | 816 | 902 | 86 | 11 |
| Chittenden..... | 2,907 | 2,474 | -433 | -15 |
| Essex..... | 159 | 249 | 90 | 57 |
| Franklin..... | 1,473 | 1,396 | -77 | -5 |
| Grand Isle..... | 91 | 110 | 19 | 21 |
| Lamoille..... | 562 | 385 | -177 | -31 |
| Orange..... | 508 | 646 | 138 | 27 |
| Orleans..... | 546 | 806 | 260 | 48 |
| Rutland..... | 1,328 | 1,685 | 357 | 27 |
| Washington..... | 1,212 | 1,368 | 156 | 13 |
| Windham..... | 900 | 941 | 41 | 5 |
| Windsor..... | 1,237 | 1,330 | 93 | 8 |
| Total..... | 13,230 | 14,140 | 910 | 7 |
| Virginia: | | | | |
| Accomack..... | 1,195 | 890 | -305 | -26 |
| Albemarle..... | 672 | 473 | -199 | -30 |
| Alexandria..... | 2,851 | 1,962 | -889 | -31 |
| Alleghany..... | 111 | 161 | 50 | 45 |
| Amelia..... | 148 | 123 | -25 | -17 |
| Amherst..... | 273 | 285 | 12 | 4 |
| Appomattox..... | 220 | 224 | 4 | 2 |
| Arlington..... | 1,373 | 1,311 | -62 | -5 |
| Augusta..... | 437 | 517 | 80 | 18 |
| Bath..... | 18 | 63 | 45 | 250 |
| Bedford..... | 392 | 426 | 34 | 9 |
| Bland..... | 40 | 37 | -3 | -8 |
| Botetourt..... | 290 | 140 | -150 | -52 |
| Bristol..... | 300 | 329 | 29 | 10 |
| Brunswick..... | 442 | 402 | -40 | -9 |
| Buchanan..... | 778 | 695 | -83 | -11 |
| Buckingham..... | 354 | 367 | 13 | 4 |
| Buena Vista..... | 114 | 146 | 32 | 28 |
| Campbell..... | 645 | 701 | 56 | 9 |
| Caroline..... | 478 | 457 | -21 | -4 |
| Carroll..... | 248 | 251 | 3 | 1 |
| Charles City..... | 352 | 226 | -126 | -36 |
| Charlotte..... | 386 | 399 | 13 | 3 |
| Charlottesville..... | 1,107 | 1,058 | -49 | -4 |
| Chesapeake..... | 3,076 | 3,089 | 13 | 0 |
| Chesterfield..... | 897 | 1,052 | 155 | 17 |
| Clarke..... | 101 | 94 | -7 | -7 |
| Clifton Forge..... | 45 | 113 | 68 | 151 |
| Colonial Heights..... | 125 | 102 | -23 | -18 |
| Covington..... | 164 | 194 | 30 | 18 |
| Craig..... | 16 | 20 | 4 | 25 |
| Culpeper..... | 396 | 424 | 28 | 7 |

806
203

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits
Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

| State and County | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979 | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984 | Absolute Change | Percent Change |
|----------------------|--|--|--------------------|-------------------|
| Cumberland | 285 | 292 | 7 | 2 |
| Danville | 1,172 | 1,337 | 165 | 14 |
| Dickenson | 381 | 402 | 21 | 6 |
| Dinwiddie | 549 | 485 | -64 | -12 |
| Emporia | 208 | 179 | -29 | -14 |
| Essex | 137 | 107 | -30 | -22 |
| Fairfax | 4,316 | 4,048 | -268 | -6 |
| Falls Church | 20 | 4 | -16 | -80 |
| Fauquier | 341 | 364 | 23 | 7 |
| Floyd | 91 | 78 | -13 | -14 |
| Fluvanna | 246 | 253 | 7 | 3 |
| Franklin | 457 | 360 | -97 | -21 |
| Franklin | 482 | 379 | -103 | -21 |
| Frederick | 217 | 232 | 15 | 7 |
| Fredericksburg | 394 | 398 | 4 | 1 |
| Galax | 114 | 144 | 30 | 26 |
| Giles | 206 | 163 | -43 | -21 |
| Gloucester | 264 | 255 | -9 | -3 |
| Goochland | 233 | 172 | -61 | -26 |
| Grayson | 161 | 152 | -9 | -6 |
| Greene | 126 | 102 | -24 | -19 |
| Greensville | 530 | 435 | -95 | -18 |
| Halifax | 977 | 919 | -58 | -6 |
| Hampton | 4,123 | 2,845 | -1,278 | -31 |
| Hanover | 453 | 336 | -117 | -26 |
| Harrisonburg | 179 | 312 | 133 | 74 |
| Henrico | 1,067 | 1,379 | 312 | 29 |
| Henry | 478 | 569 | 91 | 19 |
| Highland | 15 | 26 | 11 | 73 |
| Hopewell | 580 | 815 | 235 | 41 |
| Isle Of Wight | 631 | 547 | -84 | -13 |
| James City | 429 | 379 | -50 | -12 |
| King And Queen | 173 | 169 | -4 | -2 |
| King George | 208 | 206 | -2 | -1 |
| King William | 212 | 180 | -32 | -15 |
| Lancaster | 320 | 297 | -23 | -7 |
| Lee | 636 | 650 | 14 | 2 |
| Lexington | 85 | 54 | -31 | -36 |
| Loudoun | 471 | 380 | -91 | -19 |
| Louisa | 412 | 444 | 32 | 8 |
| Lunenburg | 165 | 214 | 49 | 30 |
| Lynchburg | 1,426 | 1,528 | 102 | 7 |
| Madison | 172 | 115 | -57 | -33 |
| Manassas | 205 | 215 | 10 | 5 |
| Manassas Park | 195 | 140 | -55 | -28 |
| Martinsville | 467 | 393 | -74 | -16 |
| Mathews | 119 | 114 | -5 | -4 |
| Mecklenburg | 241 | 370 | 129 | 54 |
| Middlesex | 74 | 92 | 18 | 24 |
| Montgomery | 700 | 745 | 45 | 6 |

204

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits
Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

| State and County | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979 | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984 | Absolute Change | Percent Change |
|----------------------|--|--|--------------------|-------------------|
| Nelson..... | 294 | 228 | -66 | -22 |
| New Kent..... | 103 | 93 | -10 | -10 |
| Newport News..... | 5,728 | 5,411 | -317 | -6 |
| Norfolk..... | 14,998 | 12,573 | -2,425 | -16 |
| Northampton..... | 835 | 676 | -159 | -19 |
| Northumberland..... | 196 | 223 | 27 | 14 |
| Norton..... | 102 | 163 | 61 | 60 |
| Nottoway..... | 398 | 343 | -55 | -14 |
| Orange..... | 328 | 258 | -70 | -21 |
| Page..... | 258 | 216 | -42 | -16 |
| Patrick..... | 126 | 186 | 60 | 48 |
| Petersburg..... | 2,914 | 2,604 | -310 | -11 |
| Pittsylvania..... | 1,086 | 1,126 | 40 | 4 |
| Portsmouth..... | 6,180 | 5,666 | -514 | -8 |
| Powhatan..... | 161 | 64 | -97 | -60 |
| Prince Edward..... | 492 | 534 | 42 | 9 |
| Prince George..... | 224 | 263 | 39 | 17 |
| Prince William..... | 1,618 | 1,581 | -37 | -2 |
| Pulaski..... | 416 | 632 | 216 | 52 |
| Radford..... | 86 | 82 | -4 | -5 |
| Rappahannock..... | 80 | 57 | -23 | -29 |
| Richmond County..... | 145 | 140 | -5 | -3 |
| Richmond..... | 14,428 | 12,835 | -1,593 | -11 |
| Roanoke County..... | 606 | 495 | -111 | -18 |
| Roanoke..... | 4,637 | 3,848 | -789 | -17 |
| Rockbridge..... | 195 | 229 | 34 | 17 |
| Rockingham..... | 403 | 333 | -70 | -17 |
| Russell..... | 508 | 521 | 13 | 3 |
| Scott..... | 316 | 384 | 68 | 22 |
| Shenandoah..... | 226 | 241 | 15 | 7 |
| Smyth..... | 424 | 518 | 94 | 22 |
| Southampton..... | 699 | 610 | -89 | -13 |
| Spotsylvania..... | 510 | 306 | -204 | -40 |
| Stafford..... | 312 | 266 | -46 | -15 |
| Staunton..... | 236 | 487 | 251 | 106 |
| Suffolk..... | 2,087 | 2,050 | -37 | -2 |
| Surry..... | 256 | 198 | -58 | -23 |
| Sussex..... | 517 | 500 | -17 | -3 |
| Tazewell..... | 801 | 1,074 | 273 | 34 |
| Virginia Beach..... | 3,037 | 2,402 | -635 | -21 |
| Warren..... | 218 | 301 | 83 | 38 |
| Washington..... | 472 | 416 | -56 | -12 |
| Waynesboro..... | 264 | 227 | -37 | -14 |
| Westmoreland..... | 490 | 449 | -41 | -8 |
| Williamsburg..... | 70 | 51 | -19 | -27 |
| Winchester..... | 391 | 314 | -77 | -20 |
| Wise..... | 650 | 1,093 | 443 | 68 |
| Wythe..... | 340 | 448 | 108 | 32 |
| York..... | 381 | 293 | -88 | -23 |
| Total..... | 114,429 | 105,513 | -8,916 | -8 |

nos 205

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits
Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

| State and County | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979 | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984 | Absolute Change | Percent Change |
|-------------------|--|--|--------------------|-------------------|
| Washington: | | | | |
| Adams..... | 387 | 443 | 56 | 14 |
| Asotin..... | 634 | 705 | 71 | 11 |
| Benton..... | 876 | 1,639 | 763 | 87 |
| Chelan..... | 1,102 | 1,165 | 63 | 6 |
| Clallam..... | 1,342 | 1,696 | 354 | 26 |
| Clark..... | 4,047 | 6,553 | 2,506 | 62 |
| Columbia..... | 101 | 121 | 20 | 20 |
| Cowlitz..... | 2,289 | 3,055 | 766 | 33 |
| Douglas..... | 339 | 388 | 49 | 14 |
| Ferry..... | 109 | 189 | 80 | 73 |
| Franklin..... | 894 | 1,220 | 326 | 36 |
| Garfield..... | 16 | 31 | 15 | 94 |
| Grant..... | 1,224 | 1,385 | 161 | 13 |
| Grays Harbor..... | 1,905 | 2,334 | 429 | 23 |
| Island..... | 450 | 434 | -16 | -4 |
| Jefferson..... | 433 | 364 | -69 | -16 |
| King..... | 23,061 | 24,091 | 1,030 | 4 |
| Kitsap..... | 2,442 | 2,540 | 98 | 4 |
| Kittitas..... | 488 | 454 | -34 | -7 |
| Klickitat..... | 343 | 593 | 250 | 73 |
| Lewis..... | 1,331 | 1,869 | 538 | 40 |
| Lincoln..... | 113 | 139 | 26 | 23 |
| Mason..... | 767 | 871 | 104 | 14 |
| Okanogan..... | 902 | 1,183 | 281 | 31 |
| Pacific..... | 351 | 530 | 179 | 51 |
| Pend Oreille..... | 425 | 444 | 19 | 4 |
| Pierce..... | 14,849 | 15,776 | 927 | 6 |
| San Juan..... | 46 | 50 | 4 | 9 |
| Skagit..... | 1,666 | 1,944 | 278 | 17 |
| Skamania..... | 136 | 216 | 80 | 59 |
| Snohomish..... | 6,707 | 7,584 | 877 | 13 |
| Spokane..... | 8,166 | 9,290 | 1,124 | 14 |
| Stevens..... | 584 | 944 | 360 | 62 |
| Thurston..... | 2,602 | 3,137 | 535 | 21 |
| Wahkiakum..... | 84 | 70 | -14 | -17 |
| Walla Walla..... | 1,128 | 1,136 | 8 | 1 |
| Whatcom..... | 2,119 | 2,855 | 736 | 35 |
| Whitman..... | 198 | 191 | -7 | -4 |
| Yakima..... | 6,600 | 7,826 | 1,226 | 19 |
| Total..... | 91,256 | 105,455 | 14,199 | 16 |
| West Virginia: | | | | |
| Barbour..... | 562 | 760 | 198 | 35 |
| Berkeley..... | 1,073 | 996 | -77 | -7 |
| Boone..... | 1,121 | 1,263 | 142 | 13 |
| Braxton..... | 505 | 476 | -29 | -6 |
| Brooke..... | 745 | 698 | -47 | -6 |
| Cabell..... | 2,936 | 2,794 | -142 | -5 |
| Calhoun..... | 305 | 281 | -24 | -8 |

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits
Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

| State and County | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979 | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984 | Absolute Change | Percent Change |
|------------------|--|--|--------------------|-------------------|
| Clay | 495 | 886 | 391 | 79 |
| Doddridge | 204 | 235 | 31 | 15 |
| Fayette | 2,966 | 2,769 | -197 | -7 |
| Gilmer | 195 | 222 | 27 | 14 |
| Grant | 340 | 215 | -125 | -37 |
| Greenbrier | 526 | 878 | 352 | 67 |
| Hampshire | 570 | 419 | -151 | -26 |
| Hancock | 946 | 1,170 | 224 | 24 |
| Hardy | 263 | 200 | -63 | -24 |
| Harrison | 2,084 | 2,316 | 232 | 11 |
| Jackson | 341 | 682 | 341 | 100 |
| Jefferson | 885 | 662 | -223 | -25 |
| Kanawha | 4,223 | 5,730 | 1,507 | 36 |
| Lewis | 650 | 544 | -106 | -16 |
| Lincoln | 1,076 | 1,658 | 582 | 54 |
| Logan | 1,679 | 2,243 | 564 | 34 |
| Marion | 1,767 | 1,819 | 52 | 3 |
| Marshall | 1,010 | 1,161 | 151 | 15 |
| Mason | 420 | 1,030 | 610 | 145 |
| McDowell | 4,142 | 4,444 | 302 | 7 |
| Mercer | 2,486 | 2,871 | 385 | 15 |
| Mineral | 897 | 689 | -208 | -23 |
| Mingo | 2,730 | 3,028 | 298 | 11 |
| Monongalia | 721 | 1,008 | 287 | 40 |
| Monroe | 140 | 272 | 132 | 94 |
| Morgan | 156 | 171 | 15 | 10 |
| Nicholas | 882 | 1,013 | 131 | 15 |
| Ohio | 1,709 | 1,375 | -334 | -20 |
| Pendleton | 221 | 131 | -90 | -41 |
| Pleasants | 143 | 191 | 48 | 34 |
| Pocahontas | 200 | 149 | -51 | -26 |
| Preston | 911 | 974 | 63 | 7 |
| Putnam | 519 | 702 | 183 | 35 |
| Raleigh | 2,691 | 2,674 | -17 | -1 |
| Randolph | 742 | 709 | -33 | -4 |
| Ritchie | 213 | 254 | 41 | 19 |
| Roane | 409 | 520 | 111 | 27 |
| Summers | 732 | 687 | -45 | -6 |
| Taylor | 546 | 662 | 116 | 21 |
| Tucker | 161 | 108 | -53 | -33 |
| Tyler | 209 | 323 | 114 | 55 |
| Upshur | 594 | 647 | 53 | 9 |
| Wayne | 1,150 | 1,629 | 479 | 42 |
| Webster | 736 | 771 | 35 | 5 |
| Wetzel | 489 | 857 | 368 | 75 |
| Wirt | 74 | 206 | 132 | 178 |
| Wood | 1,863 | 2,155 | 292 | 16 |
| Wyoming | 1,772 | 1,851 | 79 | 4 |
| Total | 56,125 | 63,178 | 7,053 | 13 |

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits
Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

| State and County | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979 | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984 | Absolute Change | Percent Change |
|------------------|--|--|--------------------|-------------------|
| Wisconsin: | | | | |
| Adams..... | 352 | 619 | 267 | 76 |
| Ashland..... | 518 | 749 | 231 | 45 |
| Barron..... | 1,131 | 1,458 | 327 | 29 |
| Bayfield..... | 436 | 764 | 328 | 75 |
| Brown..... | 4,393 | 4,939 | 546 | 12 |
| Buffalo..... | 318 | 424 | 106 | 33 |
| Burnett..... | 610 | 684 | 74 | 12 |
| Calumet..... | 407 | 444 | 37 | 9 |
| Chippewa..... | 1,701 | 2,112 | 411 | 24 |
| Clark..... | 682 | 1,020 | 338 | 50 |
| Columbia..... | 1,069 | 1,138 | 69 | 6 |
| Crawford..... | 431 | 578 | 147 | 34 |
| Dane..... | 5,778 | 5,901 | 123 | 2 |
| Dodge..... | 1,160 | 1,391 | 231 | 20 |
| Door..... | 263 | 484 | 221 | 84 |
| Douglas..... | 2,153 | 2,744 | 591 | 27 |
| Dunn..... | 851 | 1,068 | 217 | 25 |
| Eau Claire..... | 2,405 | 3,123 | 718 | 30 |
| Florence..... | 141 | 168 | 27 | 19 |
| Fond du Lac..... | 1,749 | 2,221 | 472 | 27 |
| Forest..... | 440 | 593 | 153 | 35 |
| Grant..... | 727 | 1,253 | 526 | 72 |
| Green..... | 634 | 764 | 130 | 21 |
| Green Lake..... | 336 | 479 | 143 | 43 |
| Iowa..... | 304 | 495 | 191 | 63 |
| Iron..... | 183 | 227 | 44 | 24 |
| Jackson..... | 579 | 1,009 | 430 | 74 |
| Jefferson..... | 918 | 1,604 | 686 | 75 |
| Juneau..... | 575 | 949 | 374 | 65 |
| Kenosha..... | 4,037 | 5,607 | 1,570 | 39 |
| Kewaunee..... | 207 | 376 | 169 | 82 |
| La Crosse..... | 1,966 | 3,045 | 1,079 | 55 |
| Lafayette..... | 257 | 403 | 146 | 57 |
| Langlade..... | 799 | 1,084 | 285 | 36 |
| Lincoln..... | 500 | 977 | 477 | 95 |
| Manitowoc..... | 1,397 | 2,113 | 716 | 51 |
| Marathon..... | 2,147 | 3,008 | 861 | 40 |
| Marquette..... | 1,246 | 1,511 | 265 | 21 |
| Marquette..... | 291 | 425 | 134 | 46 |
| Menominee..... | 610 | 881 | 271 | 44 |
| Milwaukee..... | 53,794 | 68,863 | 15,069 | 28 |
| Monroe..... | 827 | 1,312 | 485 | 59 |
| Oconto..... | 655 | 1,027 | 372 | 57 |
| Oneida..... | 849 | 986 | 137 | 16 |
| Outagamie..... | 2,363 | 3,407 | 1,044 | 44 |
| Ozaukee..... | 608 | 598 | -10 | -2 |
| Pepin..... | 179 | 219 | 40 | 22 |
| Pierce..... | 489 | 661 | 172 | 35 |
| Polk..... | 983 | 1,308 | 325 | 33 |

208

TABLE F-1—Cont.

Absolute and Percent Change In Numbers of Children Receiving AFDC Benefits
Between 1979 and 1984 By State and County

| State and County | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1979 | Children Receiving AFDC Payments in 1984 | Absolute Change | Percent Change |
|-------------------|--|--|--------------------|-------------------|
| Portage | 1,142 | 1,371 | 229 | 20 |
| Price | 334 | 463 | 129 | 39 |
| Racine | 7,054 | 8,410 | 1,356 | 19 |
| Richland | 527 | 748 | 221 | 42 |
| Rock | 4,581 | 6,263 | 1,682 | 37 |
| Rusk | 419 | 842 | 423 | 101 |
| Sauk | 1,286 | 1,392 | 106 | 8 |
| Sawyer | 612 | 992 | 380 | 62 |
| Shawano | 760 | 1,228 | 468 | 62 |
| Sheboygan | 1,592 | 2,397 | 805 | 51 |
| St. Croix | 702 | 850 | 148 | 21 |
| Taylor | 323 | 454 | 131 | 41 |
| Trempealeau | 684 | 842 | 158 | 23 |
| Vernon | 429 | 796 | 367 | 86 |
| Vilas | 413 | 665 | 252 | 61 |
| Walworth | 1,088 | 1,568 | 480 | 44 |
| Washburn | 441 | 611 | 170 | 39 |
| Washington | 1,290 | 1,664 | 374 | 29 |
| Waukesha | 2,582 | 3,188 | 606 | 23 |
| Waupaca | 879 | 1,186 | 307 | 35 |
| Waushara | 443 | 679 | 236 | 53 |
| Winnebago | 3,159 | 3,395 | 236 | 7 |
| Wood | 1,603 | 2,013 | 410 | 26 |
| Total | 137,791 | 179,230 | 41,439 | 30 |
| Wyoming: | | | | |
| Albany | 236 | 249 | 13 | 6 |
| Big Horn | 120 | 144 | 24 | 20 |
| Campbell | 86 | 197 | 111 | 129 |
| Carbon | 192 | 385 | 193 | 101 |
| Converse | 112 | 154 | 42 | 38 |
| Crook | 51 | 23 | -28 | -55 |
| Fremont | 361 | 496 | 135 | 37 |
| Goshen | 193 | 274 | 81 | 42 |
| Hot Springs | 38 | 43 | 5 | 13 |
| Johnson | 20 | 44 | 24 | 120 |
| Laramie | 1,174 | 1,305 | 131 | 11 |
| Lincoln | 76 | 81 | 5 | 7 |
| Natrona | 733 | 1,170 | 437 | 60 |
| Niobrara | 38 | 36 | -2 | -5 |
| Park | 197 | 181 | -16 | -8 |
| Platte | 79 | 75 | -4 | -5 |
| Sheridan | 168 | 252 | 84 | 50 |
| Sublette | 5 | 18 | 13 | 260 |
| Sweetwater | 250 | 508 | 258 | 103 |
| Teton | 23 | 29 | 6 | 26 |
| Uinta | 83 | 146 | 63 | 76 |
| Washakie | 87 | 95 | 8 | 9 |
| Weston | 53 | 81 | 28 | 53 |
| Total | 4,375 | 5,936 | 1,611 | 1,086 |

TABLE F-2
1984 AFDC High Participation Counties

| | | |
|--------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| CALIFORNIA: | COLORADO: | ILLINOIS—Cont. |
| Alameda | Adams | Henderson |
| Alpine | Alamosa | Henry |
| Amador | Bent | Jackson |
| Butte | Chaffee | Jefferson |
| Calaveras | Crowley | Kane |
| Colusa | Delta | Kankakee |
| Contra Costa | Denver | Knox |
| Del Norte | Fremont | La Salle |
| El Dorado | Mesa | Lake |
| Fresno | Pueblo | Lee |
| Glenn | Rio Blanco | Logan |
| Humboldt | | Macon |
| Imperial | CONNECTICUT: | Macoupin |
| Inyo | Fairfield | Madison |
| Kern | Hartford | Marion |
| Kings | New Haven | Marshall |
| Lake | Tolland | Mason |
| Lassen | Windham | Massac |
| Los Angeles | | McLean |
| Madera | DELAWARE: | Menard |
| Mariposa | New Castle | Montgomery |
| Mendocino | | Morgan |
| Merced | DISTRICT OF | Peoria |
| Modoc | COLUMBIA: | Perry |
| Monterey | Washington | Pope |
| Napa | | Pulaski |
| Nevada | GEORGIA: | Randolph |
| Orange | Fulton | Rock Island |
| Placer | Twiggs | Sangamon |
| Plumas | Upson | St. Clair |
| Riverside | | Stephenson |
| Sacramento | HAWAII: | Tazewell |
| San Benito | Hawaii | Union |
| San Bernardino | Honolulu | Vermilion |
| San Diego | Kauai | White |
| San Francisco | Maui | Whiteside |
| San Joaquin | | Will |
| Santa Barbara | IDAHO: | Williamson |
| Santa Clara | Benewah | Winnebago |
| Santa Cruz | Shoshone | Woodford |
| Shasta | | |
| Siskiyou | ILLINOIS: | INDIANA: |
| Solano | Adams | Floyd |
| Sonoma | Alexander | Howard |
| Stanislaus | Bond | Lake |
| Sutter | Cass | Marion |
| Tehama | Champaign | St. Joseph |
| Trinity | Christian | |
| Tulare | Coles | |
| Tuolumne | Cook | IOWA: |
| Ventura | De Kalb | Appanoose |
| Yolo | Effingham | Black Hawk |
| Yuba | Franklin | Boone |
| | Fulton | Bremer |
| | Grundy | Cerro Gordo |
| | Hardin | Clay |

TABLE F-2—Cont.
1984 AFDC High Participation Counties

| IOWA—Cont. | MAINE—Cont. | MICHIGAN—Cont. |
|----------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Clinton | Kennebec | Houghton |
| Dallas | Penobscot | Huron |
| Des Moines | York | Ingham |
| Dubuque | | Ionia |
| Floyd | MARYLAND: | Iosco |
| Henry | Allegany | Iron |
| Jasper | Baltimore City | Isabella |
| Jefferson | Cecil | Jackson |
| Lee | Charles | Kalamazoo |
| Linn | Dorchester | Kalkaska |
| Louisia | Prince George's | Kent |
| Marshall | Queen Anne's | Keweenaw |
| Mills | Somerset | Lake |
| Muscatine | | Lapeer |
| Page | MASSACHUSETTS: | Lenawee |
| Polk | Berkshire | Livingston |
| Pottawattamie | Bristol | Luce |
| Scott | Essex | Mackinac |
| Union | Franklin | Macomb |
| Wapello | Hampden | Manistee |
| Warren | Plymouth | Marquette |
| Webster | Suffolk | Mason |
| Woodbury | Worcester | Mecosta |
| | | Menominee |
| KANSAS: | MICHIGAN: | Midland |
| Atchison | Alcona | Missaukee |
| Butler | Alger | Monroe |
| Cherokee | Allegan | Montcalm |
| Cowley | Alpena | Montmorency |
| Crawford | Antrim | Muskegon |
| Ford | Arenac | Newaygo |
| Franklin | Baraga | Oakland |
| Harvey | Barry | Oceana |
| Labette | Bay | Ogemaw |
| Miami | Benzie | Ontonagon |
| Montgomery | Berrien | Osceola |
| Reno | Branch | Oscoda |
| Saline | Calhoun | Otsego |
| Sedgwick | Cass | Otawawa |
| Shawnee | Charlevoix | Rockcommon |
| Wyandotte | Cheboygan | Saginaw |
| | Chippewa | Sanilac |
| KENTUCKY: | Clare | Schoolcraft |
| Campbell | Clinton | Shiawassee |
| Jefferson | Crawford | St. Clair |
| Kenton | Delta | St. Joseph |
| McCracken | Dickinson | Tuscola |
| | Eaton | Van Buren |
| LOUISIANA: | Emmet | Washtenaw |
| St. John The Baptist | Genesee | Wayne |
| | Gladwin | Wexford |
| MAINE: | Gogebic | |
| Androscoggin | Grand Traverse | |
| Cumberland | Gratiot | |
| Franklin | Hillsdale | |

TABLE F-2—*Cont.*
1984 AFDC High Participation Counties

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| MINNESOTA: Anoka Beltrami Blue Earth Carlton Cass Chisago Clay Clearwater Dakota Hennepin Isanti Itasca Kandiyohi Koochiching Lake Mille Lacs Olmsted Pine Polk Ramsey Sherburne St. Louis Washington Wright | NEBRASKA—Cont. Scotts Bluff Thurston NEVADA: Esmeralda NEW HAMPSHIRE: Strafford NEW JERSEY: Atlantic Burlington Camden Cape May Cumberland Essex Gloucester Hudson Mercer Middlesex Monmouth Ocean Passaic Salem Somerset Union Warren | OHIO—Cont. Ashtabula Athens Auglaize Belmont Brown Butler Carroll Champaign Clark Clermont Clinton Columbiana Crawford Cuyahoga Darke Defiance Delaware Erie Fairfield Fayette Franklin Gallia Greene Guernsey Hamilton Hancock Hardin Harrison Henry Highland Hocking Huron Jackson Jefferson Lake Lawrence Licking Logan Lorain Lucas Madison Mahoning Marion Medina Meigs Mercer Miami Monroe Montgomery Morgan Morrow Muskingum Noble Ottawa |
| MISSISSIPPI: Claiborne | | |
| MISSOURI: Boone Buchanan Cole Dunklin Jackson Marion Mississippi Pemiscot Ralls Scott St. Francois St. Louis St. Louis City Stoddard Washington | NEW YORK: Allegany Chautauqua Chemung Cortland Erie Monroe New York Niagara Oneida Onondaga Orange Orleans Oswego Schenectady Suffolk Westchester | |
| MONTANA: Park Silver Bow | NORTH CAROLINA: Scotland | |
| NEBRASKA: Adams Douglas Hall Lancaster Lincoln | NORTH DAKOTA: Roulette OHIO: Adams Allen Ashland | |

61212

TABLE F-2—Cont.
1984 AFDC High Participation Counties

| | | |
|---------------|------------------------|------------------|
| OHIO—Cont. | PENNSYLVANIA— Cont. | WASHINGTON—Cont. |
| Paulding | Philadelphia | Pierce |
| Perry | Venango | Skagit |
| Pickaway | Washington | Skamania |
| Pike | Westmoreland | Snohomish |
| Portage | Wyoming | Spokane |
| Preble | York | Thurston |
| Richland | | Whatcom |
| Ross | RHODE ISLAND: | Yakima |
| Sandusky | Kent | WEST VIRGINIA: |
| Scioto | Providence | Boone |
| Seneca | Washington | Fayette |
| Shelby | | Hancock |
| Stark | SOUTH CAROLINA: | Kanawha |
| Summit | Allendale | Lincoln |
| Trumbull | Newberry | Marshall |
| Tuscarawas | Union | Mason |
| Union | UTAH: | McDowell |
| Van Wert | Carbon | Mercer |
| Vinton | Weber | Mingo |
| Warren | | Taylor |
| Washington | VERMONT: | Wetzel |
| Williams | Bennington | Wirt |
| Wood | Chittenden | |
| OREGON: | Franklin | WISCONSIN: |
| Gilliam | Rutland | Adams |
| Lane | Windsor | Ashland |
| Multnomah | | Barron |
| PENNSYLVANIA: | VIRGINIA: | Bayfield |
| Allegheny | Buena Vista | Brown |
| Armstrong | Charlottesville | Burnett |
| Beaver | Fredericksburg | Calumet |
| Blair | Harrisonburg | Chippewa |
| Butler | Hopewell | Columbia |
| Cambria | Newport News | Dane |
| Cameron | Northumberland | Dodge |
| Chester | Petersburg | Door |
| Clarion | Richmond City | Douglas |
| Clearfield | Staunton | Dunn |
| Clinton | Williamsburg | Eau Claire |
| Crawford | WASHINGTON: | Florence |
| Dauphin | Asotin | Fond du Lac |
| Delaware | Chelan | Forest |
| Elk | Clallam | Green |
| Erie | Clark | Green Lake |
| Fayette | Columbia | Iron |
| Greene | Cowlitz | Jackson |
| Lackawanna | Grays Harbor | Jefferson |
| Lawrence | King | Juneau |
| Lehigh | Klickitat | Kenosha |
| Luzerne | Lewis | Kewaunee |
| McKean | Mason | La Crosse |
| Mercer | Pacific | Langlade |
| Northampton | Pend Oreille | Lincoln |
| | | Manitowoc |

S1213

TABLE F-2—*Cont.*
1984 AFDC High Participation Counties

| WISCONSIN—Cont. | WISCONSIN—Cont. | WISCONSIN—Cont. |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Marathon | Racine | Washington |
| Marinette | Richland | Waukesha |
| Marquette | Rock | Waupaca |
| Menominee | Rusk | Waushara |
| Milwaukee | Sauk | Winnebago |
| Monroe | Sawyer | Wood |
| Oconto | Shawano | |
| Oneida | Sheboygan | WYOMING: |
| Outagamie | St. Croix | Carbon |
| Ozaukee | Trempealeau | Laramie |
| Pepin | Vernon | Natrona |
| Pierce | Vilas | Sheridan |
| Polk | Walworth | Uinta |
| Portage | Washburn | |

TABLE F-3
1984 AFDC Low Participation Counties

| | | |
|------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| ALABAMA: | ARKANSAS—Cont. | IDAHO—Cont. |
| Bibb | White | Franklin |
| Blount | Yell | Fremont |
| Cherokee | | Gooding |
| Chilton | CALIFORNIA: | Jefferson |
| Clay | Sierra | Jerome |
| Cleburne | | Latah |
| Covington | COLORADO: | Lemhi |
| Cullman | Baca | Lincoln |
| Dale | Boulder | Madison |
| De Kalb | Cheyenne | Minidoka |
| Lamar | Custer | Oneida |
| Lawrence | Douglas | Owyhee |
| Marion | Eagle | Teton |
| Marshall | Grand | Twin Falls |
| Winston | Hinsdale | Washington |
| | Kit Carson | |
| ARIZONA: | Ouray | |
| Yuma | Park | INDIANA: |
| | Pitkin | Adams |
| ARKANSAS: | Summit | Daviess |
| Baxter | Yuma | Dubois |
| Benton | | Greene |
| Boone | FLORIDA: | Lagrange |
| Carroll | Clay | Marshall |
| Cleburne | Hillsborough | Owen |
| Crawford | | Pulaski |
| Faulkner | GEORGIA: | Putnam |
| Franklin | Banks | Rush |
| Fulton | Brantley | Spencer |
| Garland | Chattahoochee | Steuben |
| Grant | Cherokee | |
| Greene | Dawson | IOWA: |
| Hempstead | Forsyth | Audubon |
| Howard | Gwinnett | Ida |
| Izard | Habersham | Lyon |
| Johnson | Jeff Davis | Mitchell |
| Logan | Murray | Plymouth |
| Lonoke | Pickens | Shelby |
| Madison | Towns | Sioux |
| Marion | Union | |
| Montgomery | White | KANSAS: |
| Newton | Whitfield | Barber |
| Perry | | Cheyenne |
| Pike | IDAHO: | Coffey |
| Polk | Adams | Comanche |
| Pope | Bear Lake | Decatur |
| Randolph | Bingham | Dickinson |
| Saline | Blaine | Edwards |
| Scott | Bonneville | Ellis |
| Searcy | Butte | Ellsworth |
| Sebastian | Caribou | Gove |
| Sevier | Cassia | Graham |
| Sharp | Clark | Greeley |
| Stone | Custer | Harper |
| Washington | Elmore | Haskell |
| | | Hodgeman |

TABLE F-3—Cont.
1984 AFDC Low Participation Counties

| KANSAS—Cont. | MISSOURI—Cont. | NEBRASKA—Cont. |
|-----------------|----------------------|-----------------|
| Jewell | Osage | Gosper |
| Kiowa | Putnam | Greeley |
| Lincoln | Sullivan | Harlan |
| Marion | Webster | Hayes |
| Marshall | | Hitchcock |
| Meade | MONTANA: | Holt |
| Nemaha | Broadwater | Hooker |
| Ness | Carter | Johnson |
| Norton | Chouteau | Kearney |
| Osborne | Daniels | Keya Paha |
| Pratt | Fallon | Knox |
| Rawlins | Fergus | Logan |
| Republic | Garfield | McPherson |
| Russell | Golden Valley | Nance |
| Scott | Judith Basin | Pawnee |
| Sheridan | Liberty | Perkins |
| Smith | Madison | Pierce |
| Stanton | McCone | Polk |
| Trego | Meagher | Rock |
| Washington | Musselshell | Saline |
| | Petroleum | Sherman |
| KENTUCKY: | Phillips | Sioux |
| Casey | Powder River | Stanton |
| Clinton | Prairie | Thayer |
| | Sheridan | Thomas |
| LOUISIANA: | Stillwater | Valley |
| Cameron | Sweet Grass | Wayne |
| Vernon | Teton | Wheeler |
| | Toole | |
| MINNESOTA: | Treasure | NEVADA: |
| Chippewa | Wheatland | Churchill |
| Lac qui Parle | Wibaux | Douglas |
| Marshall | Yellowstone National | Elko |
| Norman | Park | Eureka |
| Pipestone | | Humboldt |
| Red Lake | NEBRASKA: | Lander |
| Renville | Antelope | Lincoln |
| Rock | Arthur | Nye |
| Stevens | Banner | Pershing |
| Traverse | Blaine | Storey |
| Yellow Medicine | Boone | |
| | Boyd | NEW MEXICO: |
| MISSISSIPPI: | Brown | Catron |
| Attala | Butler | Harding |
| Rankin | Cedar | Lincoln |
| Smith | Chase | Los Alamos |
| | Cherry | Otero |
| MISSOURI: | Cheyenne | Union |
| Atchison | Cuming | Valencia |
| Gasconade | Custer | |
| Knox | Dixon | NORTH CAROLINA: |
| Macon | Franklin | Alexander |
| Mercer | Frontier | Alleghany |
| Monroe | Furnas | Ashe |
| Nodaway | Garfield | Avery |

TABLE F-3—Cont.
1984 AFDC Low Participation Counties

| NORTH CAROLINA— Cont. | NORTH DAKOTA— Cont. | SOUTH DAKOTA— Cont. |
|--------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| Carteret | Towner | Haakon |
| Cherokee | Walsh | Hamlin |
| Chowan | Wells | Hand |
| Clay | | Hanson |
| Currituck | OHIO: | Harding |
| Davie | Holmes | Hutchinson |
| Jackson | | Hyde |
| Macon | OKLAHOMA: | Jackson |
| Madison | Alfalfa | Jerauld |
| Mitchell | Beaver | Jones |
| Moore | Canadian | Kingsbury |
| Onslow | Cimarron | Lincoln |
| Polk | Cleveland | Lyman |
| Randolph | Dewey | Marshall |
| Stokes | Ellis | McCook |
| Surry | Grant | McPherson |
| Watauga | Harper | Meade |
| Wilkes | Jefferson | Miner |
| Yadkin | Kingfisher | Moody |
| Yancey | Love | Perkins |
| | Major | Potter |
| NORTH DAKOTA: | Marshall | Sanborn |
| Adams | Payne | Spink |
| Barnes | Woods | Stanley |
| Billings | Woodward | Sully |
| Bowman | | Turner |
| Burke | OREGON: | Union |
| Cavalier | Malheur | |
| Dickey | Morrow | TENNESSEE: |
| Divide | Sherman | Bledsoe |
| Dunn | Wheeler | Bradley |
| Emmons | | Cannon |
| Golden Valley | PENNSYLVANIA: | Carter |
| Grand Forks | Lycoming | Claiborne |
| Grant | | Coffee |
| Hettinger | SOUTH CAROLINA: | Cumberland |
| Kidd | Oconee | De Kalb |
| La Moure | Saluda | Decatur |
| Logan | | Fentress |
| McHenry | SOUTH DAKOTA: | Grainger |
| McIntosh | Aurora | Greene |
| Mercer | Beadle | Hawkins |
| Nelson | Bon Homme | Henderson |
| Oliver | Brookings | Jackson |
| Pebina | Brule | Lawrence |
| Pierce | Campbell | Lewis |
| Ransom | Charles Mix | Lincoln |
| Renville | Clark | Monroe |
| Richland | Custer | Moore |
| Sheridan | Day | Overton |
| Slope | Deuel | Pickett |
| Stark | Douglas | Polk |
| Steele | Edmunds | Putnam |
| | Faulk | |
| | Grant | |

TABLE F-3—*Cont.*
1984 AFDC Low Participation Counties

| TENNESSEE—Cont. | TEXAS—Cont. | TEXAS—Cont. |
|-----------------|-------------|--------------|
| Stewart | Glasscock | Presidio |
| Sullivan | Gray | Rains |
| Van Buren | Guadalupe | Randall |
| Warren | Hale | Reagan |
| Wayne | Hall | Real |
| White | Hamilton | Reeves |
| TEXAS: | Hansford | Roberts |
| Anderson | Hardeman | Rockwall |
| Andrews | Hartley | Runnels |
| Archer | Haskell | San Saba |
| Armstrong | Hemphill | Schleicher |
| Atascosa | Hockley | Scurry |
| Bailey | Hood | Shackelford |
| Bandera | Hopkins | Sherman |
| Blanco | Hudspeth | Somervell |
| Borden | Hutchinson | Starr |
| Bosque | Irion | Stephens |
| Brazoria | Jack | Sterling |
| Brewster | Jeff Davis | Stonewall |
| Briscoe | Kendall | Sutton |
| Burnet | Kenedy | Swisher |
| Callahan | Kent | Taylor |
| Carson | Kimble | Terrell |
| Castro | King | Terry |
| Clay | Kinney | Throckmorton |
| Cochran | Knox | Upton |
| Collingsworth | Lamb | Uvalde |
| Comanche | Lampasas | Val Verde |
| Concho | Lee | Van Zandt |
| Cooke | Leon | Ward |
| Coryell | Limestone | Webb |
| Cottle | Lipscomb | Wheeler |
| Crane | Live Oak | Wichita |
| Crosby | Llano | Wilbarger |
| Culberson | Lubbock | Wilson |
| Dallam | Lynn | Winkler |
| Dawson | Mason | Wise |
| Deaf Smith | Maverick | Wood |
| Delta | McCulloch | Yoakum |
| Denton | McMullen | Young |
| Dickens | Medina | UTAH: |
| Donley | Menard | Beaver |
| Eastland | Mills | Cache |
| Edwards | Mitchell | Daggett |
| El Paso | Montague | Garfield |
| Erath | Moore | Juab |
| Fisher | Motley | Kane |
| Floyd | Nolan | Millard |
| Foard | Ochiltree | Morgan |
| Fort Bend | Oldham | Rich |
| Franklin | Parker | Sanpete |
| Gaines | Parmer | Summit |
| Gillespie | Pecos | Wasatch |
| | Potter | |

TABLE F-3—*Cont.*
1984 AFDC Low Participation Counties

| | | |
|--------------|----------------|----------------|
| UTAH—Cont. | VIRGINIA—Cont. | WASHINGTON: |
| Washington | Lexington | San Juan |
| Wayne | Madison | |
| | Mecklenburg | WEST VIRGINIA: |
| VIRGINIA: | Middlesex | Pendleton |
| Bland | Page | Tucker |
| Carroll | Powhatan | |
| Craig | Rockingham | WYOMING: |
| Essex | Scott | Crook |
| Falls Church | Spotsylvania | Lincoln |
| Floyd | Virginia Beach | Platte |
| Frederick | Washington | Suhlette |
| Giles | | |

TABLE F-4

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty
Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC |
|----------------------|--|--|
| Alabama: | | |
| Autauga..... | 20 | 54 |
| Baldwin..... | 20 | 27 |
| Barbour..... | 36 | 47 |
| Bibb..... | 26 | 31 |
| Blount..... | 19 | 20 |
| Bullock..... | 46 | 47 |
| Butler..... | 36 | 44 |
| Calhoun..... | 20 | 45 |
| Chambers.. | 22 | 60 |
| Cherokee.... | 20 | 18 |
| Chilton..... | 22 | 27 |
| Choctaw..... | 34 | 59 |
| Clarke..... | 34 | 51 |
| Clay..... | 24 | 16 |
| Cleburne.... | 19 | 24 |
| Coffee..... | 17 | 38 |
| Colbert..... | 19 | 35 |
| Conecuh..... | 36 | 51 |
| Coosa..... | 31 | 39 |
| Covington.. | 23 | 37 |
| Crenshaw... | 36 | 41 |
| Cullman..... | 18 | 15 |
| Dale..... | 20 | 20 |
| Dallas..... | 41 | 56 |
| De Kalb..... | 20 | 23 |
| Elmore..... | 24 | 39 |
| Escambia... | 25 | 43 |
| Etowah..... | 20 | 35 |
| Fayette..... | 18 | 27 |
| Franklin.... | 19 | 35 |
| Geneva..... | 22 | 49 |
| Greene..... | 57 | 60 |
| Hale..... | 48 | 46 |
| Henry..... | 29 | 62 |
| Houston..... | 20 | 48 |
| Jackson..... | 16 | 28 |
| Jefferson.... | 20 | 62 |
| Lamar..... | 21 | 29 |
| Lauder- dale..... | 17 | 32 |
| Lawrence... | 27 | 40 |
| Lee..... | 21 | 41 |
| Limestone.. | 19 | 38 |
| Lowndes..... | 58 | 63 |
| Macon..... | 40 | 74 |
| Madison..... | 17 | 38 |
| Marengo..... | 42 | 56 |
| Marion..... | 15 | 31 |

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty
Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC |
|----------------------|--|--|
| Marshall.... | 17 | 32 |
| Mobile..... | 24 | 54 |
| Monroe..... | 34 | 38 |
| Montgom- ery..... | 27 | 44 |
| Morgan..... | 16 | 38 |
| Perry..... | 57 | 51 |
| Pickens..... | 33 | 72 |
| Pike..... | 34 | 49 |
| Randolph... | 28 | 30 |
| Russell..... | 31 | 29 |
| Shelby..... | 14 | 36 |
| St. Clair..... | 19 | 35 |
| Sumter..... | 43 | 66 |
| Talladega... | 25 | 60 |
| Talla- poosa..... | 21 | 54 |
| Tuscaloo- sa..... | 23 | 56 |
| Walker..... | 19 | 45 |
| Washing- ton..... | 26 | 30 |
| Wilcox..... | 55 | 72 |
| Winston..... | 20 | 17 |
| Alaska: | | |
| Alaska..... | 12 | 64 |
| Arizona: | | |
| Apache..... | 43 | 33 |
| Cochise..... | 19 | 20 |
| Coconino... | 22 | 30 |
| Gila..... | 19 | 29 |
| Graham..... | 20 | 28 |
| Greenlee.... | 10 | 35 |
| Maricopa.... | 13 | 28 |
| Mohave..... | 14 | 12 |
| Navajo..... | 33 | 20 |
| Pima..... | 15 | 30 |
| Pinal..... | 23 | 32 |
| Santa Cruz..... | 24 | 14 |
| Yavapai..... | 15 | 12 |
| Yuma..... | 21 | 12 |
| Arkansas: | | |
| Arkansas... | 26 | 40 |
| Ashley..... | 25 | 93 |
| Baxter..... | 16 | 18 |

(216)

220

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty
Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC |
|------------------------|--|--|
| Benton..... | 13 | 30 |
| Boone..... | 21 | 17 |
| Bradley | 30 | 38 |
| Calhoun | 30 | 42 |
| Carroll..... | 20 | 16 |
| Chicot | 48 | 62 |
| Clark | 19 | 37 |
| Clay | 25 | 32 |
| Cleburne | 23 | 16 |
| Cleveland... | 17 | 45 |
| Columbia ... | 31 | 45 |
| Conway | 17 | 46 |
| Craighead .. | 17 | 33 |
| Crawford.... | 18 | 24 |
| Critten- den | 41 | 45 |
| Cross..... | 28 | 43 |
| Dallas | 19 | 75 |
| Desha | 32 | 59 |
| Drew | 17 | 49 |
| Faulkner.... | 12 | 19 |
| Franklin ... | 17 | 17 |
| Fulton | 25 | 19 |
| Garland..... | 18 | 38 |
| Grant..... | 16 | 20 |
| Greene..... | 20 | 25 |
| Hemp- stead | 25 | 33 |
| Hot Spring..... | 19 | 29 |
| Howard | 15 | 29 |
| Independ- ence..... | 15 | 29 |
| Izard | 22 | 20 |
| Jackson | 26 | 45 |
| Jefferson | 28 | 44 |
| Johnson..... | 20 | 24 |
| Lafayette ... | 41 | 40 |
| Lawrence... | 24 | 32 |
| Lee | 54 | 56 |
| Lincoln..... | 32 | 52 |
| Little River..... | 22 | 40 |
| Logan | 25 | 23 |
| Lonoke | 21 | 30 |
| Madison | 22 | 21 |
| Marion | 32 | 14 |
| Miller | 23 | 43 |
| Mississip- pi | 34 | 43 |

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty
Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC |
|-----------------------|--|--|
| Monroe..... | 44 | 50 |
| Montgom- ery | 25 | 23 |
| Nevada..... | 27 | 52 |
| Newton..... | 32 | 21 |
| Ouachita | 27 | 58 |
| Perry | 15 | 38 |
| Phillips..... | 52 | 65 |
| Pike | 19 | 29 |
| Poinsett..... | 26 | 47 |
| Polk | 29 | 27 |
| Pope..... | 17 | 28 |
| Prairie..... | 26 | 36 |
| Pulaski..... | 17 | 61 |
| Randolph ... | 20 | 20 |
| Saline | 10 | 33 |
| Scott | 25 | 32 |
| Searcy | 31 | 20 |
| Sebastian ... | 16 | 26 |
| Sevier | 17 | 21 |
| Sharp..... | 32 | 26 |
| St. Francis ... | 42 | 46 |
| Stone | 36 | 26 |
| Union | 25 | 58 |
| Van Buren..... | 20 | 30 |
| Washing- ton | 15 | 29 |
| White..... | 18 | 27 |
| Woodruff.... | 40 | 42 |
| Yell | 23 | 31 |
| California: | | |
| Alameda | 14 | 130 |
| Alpine | 18 | 57 |
| Amador | 10 | 60 |
| Butte..... | 15 | 93 |
| Calaveras... | 13 | 94 |
| Colusa..... | 12 | 56 |
| Contra Costa..... | 10 | 126 |
| Del Norte... | 16 | 87 |
| El Dorado .. | 9 | 79 |
| Fresno | 20 | 87 |
| Glenn..... | 17 | 48 |
| Humboldt .. | 15 | 97 |
| Imperial | 20 | 64 |
| Inyo..... | 11 | 64 |
| Kern | 17 | 68 |

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty
Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Childrer. Receiving AFDC |
|---------------------------|--|---|
| Kings | 19 | 84 |
| Lake | 18 | 105 |
| Lassen | 11 | 102 |
| Los Angeles .. | 18 | 98 |
| Madera | 21 | 74 |
| Marin | 8 | 63 |
| Mariposa | 15 | 60 |
| Mendo- cino | 14 | 116 |
| Merced | 20 | 86 |
| Modoc | 17 | 67 |
| Mono | 12 | 58 |
| Monterey ... | 15 | 80 |
| Napa | 9 | 92 |
| Nevada | 10 | 79 |
| Orange | 9 | 66 |
| Placer | 10 | 96 |
| Plumas | 12 | 74 |
| Riverside | 15 | 90 |
| Sacramen- to | 15 | 136 |
| San Benito | 16 | 56 |
| San Bernar- dino | 14 | 72 |
| San Diego .. | 14 | 85 |
| San Francis- co | 19 | 128 |
| San Joaquin .. | 18 | 117 |
| San Luis Obispo.... | 13 | 67 |
| San Mateo | 7 | 106 |
| Santa Barbara.. | 11 | 89 |
| Santa Clara | 9 | 132 |
| Santa Cruz | 13 | 88 |
| Shasta | 13 | 114 |
| Sierra | 13 | 75 |
| Siskiyou | 15 | 71 |
| Solano | 12 | 96 |
| Sonoma | 11 | 117 |
| Stanislaus.. | 16 | 99 |
| Sutter | 14 | 84 |

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty
Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC |
|---------------------|--|--|
| Tehama | 16 | 75 |
| Trinity | 14 | 89 |
| Tulare | 23 | 87 |
| Tuolumne .. | 16 | 58 |
| Ventura | 10 | 89 |
| Yolo | 14 | 100 |
| Yuba | 20 | 92 |
| Colorado: | | |
| Adams | 9 | 79 |
| Alamosa | 22 | 43 |
| Arapahoe .. | 5 | 32 |
| Archuleta .. | 21 | 29 |
| Baca | 25 | 23 |
| Bent | 13 | 86 |
| Boulder | 7 | 49 |
| Chaffee | 8 | 74 |
| Cheyenne .. | 24 | 6 |
| Clear Creek | 4 | 29 |
| Conejos | 36 | 39 |
| Costilla | 42 | 37 |
| Crowley | 21 | 81 |
| Custer | 21 | 27 |
| Delta | 15 | 60 |
| Denver | 20 | 90 |
| Dolores | 26 | 35 |
| Douglas | 4 | 12 |
| Eagle | 9 | 22 |
| El Paso | 13 | 38 |
| Elbert | 5 | 39 |
| Fremont | 12 | 72 |
| Garfield | 7 | 31 |
| Gilpin | 8 | 13 |
| Grand | 6 | 26 |
| Gunnison ... | 8 | 11 |
| Hinsdale | 14 | 20 |
| Huerfano ... | 30 | 50 |
| Jackson | 8 | 49 |
| Jefferson | 4 | 41 |
| Kiowa | 16 | 29 |
| Kit Carson | 24 | 11 |
| La Plata | 14 | 53 |
| Lake | 3 | 128 |
| Larimer | 9 | 50 |
| Las Animas... | 27 | 66 |
| Lincoln | 12 | 34 |
| Logan | 11 | 35 |

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty
Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC |
|-----------------------|--|--|
| Mesa | 9 | 49 |
| Mineral | 8 | 35 |
| Moffat | 6 | 34 |
| Montezu- ma | 17 | 24 |
| Montrose | 10 | 33 |
| Morgan | 15 | 52 |
| Otero | 28 | 70 |
| Ouray | 14 | 28 |
| Park | 12 | 9 |
| Phillips | 13 | 12 |
| Pitkin | 11 | 9 |
| Prowers | 23 | 62 |
| Pueblo | 17 | 90 |
| Rio Blanco | 5 | 25 |
| Rio Grande ... | 22 | 61 |
| Routt | 4 | 37 |
| Saguache ... | 35 | 37 |
| San Juan ... | 12 | 45 |
| San Miguel | 16 | 17 |
| Sedgwick ... | 10 | 41 |
| Summit | 5 | 2 |
| Teller | 14 | 21 |
| Washing- ton | 17 | 19 |
| Weld | 15 | 57 |
| Yuma | 21 | 17 |
| Connecticut: | | |
| Fairfield | 11 | 102 |
| Hartford | 12 | 115 |
| Litchfield ... | 6 | 70 |
| Middlesex .. | 8 | 76 |
| New Haven | 13 | 103 |
| New London ... | 11 | 79 |
| Tolland | 5 | 88 |
| Windham ... | 11 | 82 |
| Delaware: | | |
| Kent | 17 | 299 |
| New Castle | 14 | 26 |
| Sussex | 18 | 62 |

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty
Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC |
|--------------------------|--|--|
| District of Columbia: | | |
| Washing- ton | 26 | 164 |
| Florida: | | |
| Alachua | 21 | 44 |
| Baker | 22 | 29 |
| Bay | 21 | 28 |
| Bradford | 23 | 43 |
| Brevard | 13 | 46 |
| Broward | 13 | 30 |
| Calhoun | 29 | 31 |
| Charlotte ... | 12 | 31 |
| Citrus | 21 | 36 |
| Clay | 13 | 22 |
| Collier | 21 | 24 |
| Columbia ... | 22 | 37 |
| Dade | 19 | 37 |
| De Soto | 26 | 27 |
| Dixie | 30 | 28 |
| Duval | 22 | 52 |
| Escambia ... | 24 | 44 |
| Flagler | 27 | 50 |
| Franklin ... | 36 | 40 |
| Gadsden | 43 | 44 |
| Gilchrist | 20 | 19 |
| Glades | 24 | 31 |
| Gulf | 26 | 53 |
| Hamilton ... | 32 | 39 |
| Hardee | 35 | 23 |
| Hendry | 28 | 39 |
| Hernando ... | 20 | 37 |
| Highlands .. | 29 | 35 |
| Hillsbor- ough | 17 | 48 |
| Holmes | 31 | 27 |
| Indian River | 16 | 43 |
| Jackson | 26 | 36 |
| Jefferson ... | 36 | 35 |
| Lafayette ... | 24 | 12 |
| Lake | 20 | 31 |
| Lee | 16 | 32 |
| Leon | 19 | 44 |
| Levy | 26 | 32 |
| Liberty | 26 | 40 |
| Madison | 37 | 47 |
| Manatee | 15 | 37 |
| Marion | 23 | 43 |

223

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC |
|------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Martin..... | 16 | 28 |
| Monroe..... | 16 | 31 |
| Nassau..... | 13 | 52 |
| Okaloosa.... | 14 | 33 |
| Okeechobee..... | 17 | 39 |
| Orange..... | 18 | 44 |
| Osceola..... | 14 | 42 |
| Palm Beach..... | 14 | 39 |
| Pasco..... | 16 | 35 |
| Pinellas..... | 14 | 44 |
| Polk..... | 17 | 30 |
| Putnam..... | 29 | 45 |
| Santa Rosa..... | 20 | 25 |
| Sarasota..... | 13 | 25 |
| Seminole.... | 11 | 45 |
| St. Johns.... | 20 | 34 |
| St. Lucie.... | 26 | 53 |
| Sumter..... | 26 | 47 |
| Suwannee.. | 28 | 17 |
| Taylor..... | 29 | 33 |
| Union..... | 16 | 46 |
| Volusia..... | 19 | 40 |
| Wakulla..... | 20 | 39 |
| Walton..... | 29 | 33 |
| Washington..... | 29 | 34 |
| Georgia: | | |
| Appling..... | 35 | 29 |
| Atkinson.... | 38 | 28 |
| Bacon..... | 25 | 45 |
| Baker..... | 30 | 45 |
| Baldwin..... | 19 | 50 |
| Banks..... | 12 | 19 |
| Barrow..... | 19 | 27 |
| Bartow..... | 14 | 36 |
| Ben Hill.... | 30 | 31 |
| Berrien..... | 22 | 35 |
| Bibb..... | 26 | 50 |
| Bleckley.... | 23 | 50 |
| Brantley.... | 22 | 24 |
| Brooks..... | 42 | 41 |
| Bryan..... | 23 | 41 |
| Bulloch..... | 25 | 38 |
| Burke..... | 35 | 54 |
| Butts..... | 21 | 52 |
| Calhoun..... | 34 | 41 |

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC |
|------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Camden..... | 29 | 33 |
| Candler..... | 38 | 33 |
| Carroll..... | 18 | 37 |
| Catoosa..... | 13 | 31 |
| Charlton..... | 26 | 45 |
| Chatham.... | 25 | 55 |
| Chattahoochee.. | 12 | 21 |
| Chattooga.. | 22 | 32 |
| Cherokee.... | 12 | 21 |
| Clarke..... | 20 | 30 |
| Clay..... | 53 | 38 |
| Clayton..... | 10 | 28 |
| Clinch..... | 34 | 37 |
| Cobb..... | 7 | 31 |
| Coffee..... | 28 | 36 |
| Colquitt.... | 24 | 56 |
| Columbia... | 13 | 33 |
| Cook..... | 24 | 27 |
| Coweta..... | 22 | 44 |
| Crawford.... | 22 | 53 |
| Crisp..... | 38 | 58 |
| Dade..... | 19 | 24 |
| Dawson..... | 23 | 17 |
| De Kalb..... | 12 | 34 |
| Decatur..... | 31 | 38 |
| Dodge..... | 33 | 38 |
| Dooley..... | 40 | 54 |
| Dougherty.. | 27 | 60 |
| Douglas..... | 9 | 37 |
| Early..... | 42 | 51 |
| Echols..... | 30 | 37 |
| Effingham.. | 20 | 44 |
| Elbert..... | 24 | 49 |
| Emanuel.... | 32 | 43 |
| Evans..... | 34 | 48 |
| Fannin..... | 25 | 18 |
| Fayette..... | 5 | 22 |
| Floyd..... | 15 | 55 |
| Forsyth..... | 12 | 16 |
| Franklin.... | 20 | 28 |
| Fulton..... | 29 | 64 |
| Gilmer..... | 22 | 20 |
| Glascok.... | 24 | 28 |
| Glynn..... | 21 | 39 |
| Gordon..... | 14 | 30 |
| Grady..... | 32 | 33 |
| Greene..... | 35 | 26 |
| Gwinnett.... | 5 | 21 |

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty
Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC |
|---------------------|--|--|
| Haber- | | |
| sham | 15 | 12 |
| Hall | 12 | 32 |
| Hancock | 48 | 56 |
| Haralson | 17 | 34 |
| Harris | 20 | 38 |
| Hart | 19 | 24 |
| Heard | 20 | 34 |
| Henry | 12 | 59 |
| Houston | 15 | 40 |
| Irwin | 33 | 35 |
| Jackson | 14 | 35 |
| Jasper | 22 | 42 |
| Jeff Davis | 21 | 30 |
| Jefferson | 39 | 49 |
| Jenkins | 41 | 41 |
| Johnson | 35 | 32 |
| Jones | 19 | 43 |
| Lamar | 23 | 49 |
| Lanier | 36 | 37 |
| Laurens | 24 | 26 |
| Lee | 19 | 46 |
| Liberty | 26 | 33 |
| Lincoln | 26 | 35 |
| Long | 32 | 53 |
| Lowndes | 24 | 36 |
| Lumpkin | 18 | 32 |
| Macon | 43 | 51 |
| Madison | 18 | 25 |
| Marion | 36 | 45 |
| McDuffie | 23 | 43 |
| McIntosh | 40 | 46 |
| Meriwether | 24 | 47 |
| Miller | 33 | 41 |
| Mitchell | 39 | 45 |
| Monroe | 21 | 43 |
| Montgom- | | |
| ery | 31 | 48 |
| Morgan | 29 | 33 |
| Murray | 18 | 10 |
| Muscogee | 24 | 44 |
| Newton | 18 | 39 |
| Oconee | 10 | 35 |
| Ogleth- | | |
| orpe | 22 | 53 |
| Paulding | 12 | 39 |
| Peach | 34 | 43 |
| Pickens | 20 | 21 |
| Pierce | 26 | 29 |
| Pike | 19 | 31 |

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty
Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC |
|---------------------|--|--|
| Polk | 18 | 42 |
| Pulaski | 31 | 42 |
| Putnam | 24 | 46 |
| Quitman | 49 | 37 |
| Rabun | 18 | 20 |
| Randolph | 39 | 35 |
| Richmond | 23 | 53 |
| Rockdale | 9 | 42 |
| Schley | 29 | 51 |
| Screven | 41 | 35 |
| Seminole | 28 | 53 |
| Spalding | 23 | 34 |
| Stephens | 16 | 28 |
| Stewart | 45 | 58 |
| Sumter | 29 | 60 |
| Talbot | 27 | 45 |
| Taliaferro | 45 | 40 |
| Tattnall | 32 | 41 |
| Taylor | 39 | 61 |
| Telfair | 33 | 40 |
| Terrell | 40 | 39 |
| Thomas | 26 | 48 |
| Tift | 29 | 26 |
| Toombs | 32 | 35 |
| Towns | 27 | 16 |
| Treutlen | 36 | 43 |
| Troup | 21 | 41 |
| Turner | 43 | 30 |
| Twiggs | 21 | 78 |
| Union | 30 | 13 |
| Upson | 15 | 72 |
| Walker | 13 | 31 |
| Walton | 21 | 28 |
| Ware | 27 | 40 |
| Warren | 34 | 43 |
| Washing- | | |
| ton | 31 | 49 |
| Wayne | 22 | 51 |
| Webster | 37 | 41 |
| Wheeler | 38 | 40 |
| White | 15 | 11 |
| Whitfield | 14 | 25 |
| Wilcox | 37 | 40 |
| Wilkes | 23 | 55 |
| Wilkinson | 21 | 64 |
| Worth | 29 | 47 |
| Hawaii: | | |
| Hawaii | 15 | 119 |
| Honolulu | 13 | 111 |

123 225

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC |
|------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Kauai..... | 10 | 119 |
| Maui..... | 11 | 111 |
| Idaho: | | |
| Ada..... | 9 | 52 |
| Adams..... | 18 | 22 |
| Bannock..... | 10 | 42 |
| Bear Lake.. | 11 | 15 |
| Benewah.... | 8 | 56 |
| Bingham.... | 17 | 23 |
| Blaine..... | 12 | 19 |
| Boise..... | 12 | 53 |
| Bonner..... | 19 | 40 |
| Bonneville..... | 9 | 32 |
| Boundary... | 19 | 16 |
| Butte..... | 17 | 15 |
| Camas..... | 11 | 43 |
| Canyon..... | 19 | 35 |
| Caribou.... | 15 | 16 |
| Cassia..... | 18 | 20 |
| Clark..... | 15 | 22 |
| Clearwater..... | 10 | 46 |
| Custer..... | 23 | 7 |
| Elmore..... | 15 | 15 |
| Franklin.... | 15 | 8 |
| Fremont..... | 17 | 7 |
| Gem..... | 18 | 28 |
| Gooding..... | 22 | 19 |
| Idaho..... | 17 | 26 |
| Jefferson.... | 19 | 11 |
| Jerome..... | 17 | 24 |
| Kootenai.... | 14 | 46 |
| Latah..... | 12 | 30 |
| Lemhi..... | 21 | 25 |
| Lewis..... | 15 | 37 |
| Lincoln..... | 22 | 8 |
| Madison.... | 12 | 12 |
| Minidoka... | 18 | 19 |
| Nez Perce.. | 13 | 60 |
| Oneida..... | 24 | 5 |
| Owyhee..... | 28 | 21 |
| Payette..... | 22 | 32 |
| Power..... | 14 | 33 |
| Shoshone.... | 10 | 78 |
| Teton..... | 20 | 7 |
| Twin Falls..... | 14 | 20 |
| Valley..... | 9 | 28 |

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC |
|------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Washington..... | 26 | 28 |
| Illinois: | | |
| Adams..... | 13 | 61 |
| Alexander.. | 36 | 81 |
| Bond..... | 14 | 35 |
| Boone..... | 7 | 44 |
| Brown..... | 15 | 21 |
| Bureau..... | 9 | 24 |
| Calhoun.... | 18 | 19 |
| Carroll..... | 13 | 35 |
| Cass..... | 10 | 52 |
| Champaign..... | 10 | 87 |
| Christian.... | 11 | 49 |
| Clark..... | 10 | 34 |
| Clay..... | 15 | 31 |
| Clinton..... | 11 | 21 |
| Coles..... | 11 | 37 |
| Cook..... | 20 | 119 |
| Crawford.... | 9 | 50 |
| Cumberland..... | 13 | 23 |
| De Kalb..... | 7 | 44 |
| De Witt..... | 11 | 25 |
| Douglas..... | 12 | 31 |
| Du Page..... | 3 | 44 |
| Edgar..... | 15 | 21 |
| Edwards.... | 12 | 29 |
| Effingham.. | 9 | 39 |
| Fayette..... | 15 | 43 |
| Ford..... | 9 | 60 |
| Franklin.... | 18 | 66 |
| Fulton..... | 13 | 60 |
| Gallatin..... | 18 | 51 |
| Greene..... | 22 | 40 |
| Grundy..... | 5 | 41 |
| Hamilton.... | 19 | 46 |
| Hancock..... | 12 | 40 |
| Hardin..... | 20 | 48 |
| Henderson..... | 11 | 44 |
| Henry..... | 8 | 46 |
| Iroquois.... | 11 | 43 |
| Jackson..... | 17 | 73 |
| Jasper..... | 10 | 28 |
| Jefferson.... | 16 | 75 |
| Jersey..... | 8 | 28 |

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty
Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC |
|-----------------------|--|--|
| Jo Daviess.. | 8 | 14 |
| Johnson..... | 21 | 50 |
| Kane..... | 8 | 81 |
| Kankakee .. | 18 | 96 |
| Kendall | 5 | 23 |
| Knox..... | 10 | 52 |
| La Salle..... | 9 | 48 |
| Lake..... | 6 | 87 |
| Lawrence... | 14 | 53 |
| Lee..... | 7 | 35 |
| Living- ston | 9 | 34 |
| Logan | 9 | 41 |
| Macon..... | 14 | 66 |
| Macoupin... | 11 | 62 |
| Madison | 13 | 101 |
| Marion | 14 | 61 |
| Marshall ... | 7 | 17 |
| Mason..... | 13 | 47 |
| Massac | 19 | 65 |
| McDon- ough..... | 14 | 34 |
| McHenry.... | 5 | 32 |
| McLean | 8 | 61 |
| Menard | 8 | 46 |
| Mercer..... | 11 | 35 |
| Monroe..... | 5 | 48 |
| Montgom- ery | 12 | 48 |
| Morgan..... | 12 | 60 |
| Moultrie.... | 9 | 23 |
| Ogle | 8 | 34 |
| Peoria..... | 13 | 84 |
| Perry | 10 | 65 |
| Piatt..... | 7 | 55 |
| Pike | 18 | 55 |
| Pope..... | 17 | 78 |
| Pulaski | 40 | 85 |
| Putnam | 6 | 17 |
| Randolph ... | 9 | 52 |
| Richland ... | 10 | 38 |
| Rock Island..... | 10 | 79 |
| Saline | 19 | 52 |
| Sangamon.. | 11 | 76 |
| Schuyler.... | 13 | 21 |
| Scott | 14 | 24 |
| Shelby | 13 | 35 |
| St. Clair..... | 26 | 112 |
| Stark | 9 | 23 |

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty
Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC |
|------------------------|--|--|
| Stephen- son..... | 8 | 38 |
| Tazewell.... | 7 | 61 |
| Union | 17 | 59 |
| Vermilion .. | 14 | 66 |
| Wabash | 14 | 41 |
| Warren..... | 16 | 45 |
| Washing- ton..... | 9 | 29 |
| Wayne..... | 16 | 49 |
| White..... | 13 | 69 |
| Whiteside... | 8 | 50 |
| Will..... | 8 | 82 |
| William- son..... | 13 | 51 |
| Winneba- go..... | 10 | 77 |
| Woodford ... | 5 | 39 |
| Indiana: | | |
| Adams..... | 14 | 10 |
| Allen..... | 11 | 65 |
| Bartholo- mew | 10 | 59 |
| Benton..... | 10 | 29 |
| Blackford .. | 12 | 23 |
| Boone..... | 8 | 28 |
| Brown..... | 13 | 35 |
| Carroll..... | 8 | 29 |
| Cass | 9 | 35 |
| Clark | 10 | 73 |
| Clay | 13 | 20 |
| Clinton | 12 | 25 |
| Crawford... | 22 | 28 |
| Daviess..... | 21 | 17 |
| De Kalb..... | 7 | 29 |
| Dearborn.... | 9 | 45 |
| Decatur | 13 | 21 |
| Delaware ... | 14 | 63 |
| Dubois | 7 | 25 |
| Elkhart | 10 | 43 |
| Fayette..... | 14 | 22 |
| Floyd | 11 | 64 |
| Fountain ... | 8 | 17 |
| Franklin | 10 | 17 |
| Fulton | 11 | 19 |
| Gibson | 13 | 33 |
| Grant | 13 | 45 |
| Greene..... | 13 | 14 |
| Hamilton ... | 4 | 40 |

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC |
|------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Hancock..... | 7 | 30 |
| Harrison | 9 | 18 |
| Hendricks.. | 4 | 31 |
| Henry | 12 | 47 |
| Howard | 9 | 43 |
| Huntington..... | 8 | 14 |
| Jackson | 9 | 52 |
| Jasper..... | 9 | 18 |
| Jay | 14 | 27 |
| Jefferson | 15 | 29 |
| Jennings | 14 | 25 |
| Johnson..... | 6 | 38 |
| Knox..... | 16 | 50 |
| Kosciusko .. | 10 | 19 |
| La Porte..... | 11 | 58 |
| Lagrange.... | 23 | 6 |
| Lake..... | 15 | 94 |
| Lawrence ... | 10 | 25 |
| Madison | 12 | 48 |
| Marion | 15 | 80 |
| Marshall | 10 | 26 |
| Martin..... | 14 | 31 |
| Miami..... | 10 | 24 |
| Monroe..... | 11 | 41 |
| Montgomery..... | 6 | 27 |
| Morgan..... | 10 | 48 |
| Newton..... | 10 | 24 |
| Noble..... | 10 | 15 |
| Ohio..... | 8 | 28 |
| Orange | 16 | 16 |
| Owen | 14 | 19 |
| Parke..... | 14 | 28 |
| Perry | 11 | 27 |
| Pike | 10 | 34 |
| Porter..... | 5 | 41 |
| Posey | 10 | 39 |
| Pulaski..... | 14 | 10 |
| Putnam | 10 | 18 |
| Randolph ... | 13 | 25 |
| Ripley..... | 11 | 22 |
| Rush | 13 | 16 |
| Scott | 17 | 40 |
| Shelby | 9 | 30 |
| Spencer | 11 | 24 |
| St. Joseph .. | 12 | 70 |
| Starke..... | 15 | 27 |
| Steuben | 10 | 16 |
| Sullivan | 12 | 33 |

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC |
|--------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Switzer-land..... | 14 | 30 |
| Tippeca-noe | 9 | 39 |
| Tipton..... | 5 | 39 |
| Union | 12 | 30 |
| Vander-burgh | 14 | 76 |
| Vermil-lion | 12 | 31 |
| Vigo | 13 | 46 |
| Wabash | 9 | 27 |
| Warren..... | 12 | 15 |
| Warrick..... | 8 | 33 |
| Washing-ton..... | 18 | 16 |
| Wayne | 15 | 65 |
| Wells | 6 | 32 |
| White..... | 7 | 31 |
| Whitley | 6 | 13 |
| Iowa: | | |
| Adair | 21 | 22 |
| Adams..... | 17 | 29 |
| Allama-kee | 19 | 30 |
| Appan-oose | 22 | 74 |
| Audubon | 20 | 25 |
| Benton..... | 14 | 33 |
| Black Hawk | 11 | 111 |
| Boone..... | 9 | 72 |
| Bremer | 7 | 56 |
| Buchanan .. | 14 | 42 |
| Buena Vista | 9 | 59 |
| Butler | 10 | 56 |
| Calhoun | 12 | 47 |
| Carroll..... | 10 | 28 |
| Cass | 13 | 38 |
| Cedar | 12 | 37 |
| Cerro Gordo..... | 10 | 78 |
| Cherokee.... | 12 | 40 |
| Chicka-saw | 12 | 30 |
| Clarke..... | 22 | 28 |
| Clay | 9 | 55 |
| Clayton..... | 16 | 29 |

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty
Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC |
|-----------------------|--|--|
| Clinton | 9 | 73 |
| Crawford.... | 12 | 40 |
| Dallas | 8 | 69 |
| Davis | 30 | 24 |
| Decatur | 22 | 41 |
| Delaware ... | 17 | 35 |
| Des Moines.... | 9 | 88 |
| Dickinson... | 10 | 52 |
| Dubuque | 9 | 68 |
| Emmet | 16 | 37 |
| Fayette | 11 | 49 |
| Floyd | 9 | 72 |
| Franklin | 15 | 37 |
| Fremont | 22 | 28 |
| Greene | 17 | 38 |
| Grundy | 7 | 44 |
| Guthrie | 17 | 48 |
| Hamilton ... | 11 | 54 |
| Hancock | 8 | 51 |
| Hardin | 12 | 47 |
| Harrison ... | 18 | 56 |
| Henry | 9 | 67 |
| Howard | 18 | 21 |
| Humboldt .. | 10 | 45 |
| Ida | 17 | 21 |
| Iowa | 10 | 35 |
| Jackson | 16 | 30 |
| Jasper | 11 | 67 |
| Jefferson ... | 12 | 84 |
| Johnson | 7 | 48 |
| Jones | 11 | 47 |
| Keokuk | 14 | 38 |
| Kossuth | 14 | 29 |
| Lee | 11 | 86 |
| Linn | 7 | 107 |
| Louisa | 15 | 60 |
| Lucas | 20 | 52 |
| Lyon | 15 | 13 |
| Madison | 12 | 46 |
| Mahaska | 15 | 56 |
| Marion | 11 | 54 |
| Marshall | 9 | 87 |
| Mills | 10 | 62 |
| Mitchell | 13 | 26 |
| Monona | 18 | 45 |
| Monroe | 19 | 38 |
| Montgom- ery | 11 | 75 |
| Muscatine .. | 10 | 82 |

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty
Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC |
|--------------------------|--|--|
| O'Brien | 9 | 42 |
| Osceola | 12 | 31 |
| Page | 10 | 79 |
| Palo Alto.... | 14 | 43 |
| Plymouth... | 14 | 22 |
| Pocahon- tas | 15 | 38 |
| Polk | 10 | 113 |
| Pottawat- tamie | 12 | 103 |
| Poweshiek.. | 13 | 32 |
| Ringgold.... | 21 | 30 |
| Sac | 14 | 30 |
| Scott | 9 | 106 |
| Shelby | 16 | 18 |
| Sioux | 12 | 18 |
| Story | 8 | 41 |
| Tama | 11 | 59 |
| Taylor | 24 | 35 |
| Union | 13 | 58 |
| Van Buren.... | 23 | 31 |
| Wapello | 12 | 94 |
| Warren | 6 | 64 |
| Washing- ton | 18 | 27 |
| Wayne | 21 | 41 |
| Webster | 11 | 96 |
| Winneba- go | 7 | 59 |
| Winne- shiek | 17 | 13 |
| Woodbury .. | 14 | 85 |
| Worth | 10 | 59 |
| Wright | 12 | 58 |
| Kansas: | | |
| Allen | 12 | 47 |
| Anderson ... | 16 | 21 |
| Atchison.... | 12 | 54 |
| Barber | 14 | 15 |
| Barton | 9 | 36 |
| Bourbon | 15 | 49 |
| Brown | 16 | 46 |
| Butler | 7 | 71 |
| Chase | 14 | 32 |
| Chautau- qua | 15 | 46 |
| Cherokee.... | 17 | 60 |
| Cheyenne... | 17 | 14 |

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC |
|--------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Clark | 7 | 52 |
| Clay | 14 | 44 |
| Cloud | 15 | 36 |
| Coffey | 14 | 32 |
| Comanche.. | 9 | 32 |
| Cowley | 9 | 69 |
| Crawford.... | 15 | 63 |
| Decatur | 16 | 15 |
| Dickinson... | 15 | 48 |
| Doniphan... | 15 | 63 |
| Douglas | 10 | 61 |
| Edwards | 10 | 47 |
| Elk | 17 | 30 |
| Ellis | 9 | 37 |
| Ellsworth... | 11 | 36 |
| Finney | 11 | 47 |
| Ford | 9 | 74 |
| Franklin | 11 | 49 |
| Gcary | 23 | 61 |
| Gove | 21 | 5 |
| Graham | 17 | 15 |
| Grant | 11 | 51 |
| Gray | 9 | 28 |
| Greeley | 14 | 36 |
| Green-wood..... | 12 | 61 |
| Hamilton ... | 12 | 30 |
| Harper | 17 | 24 |
| Harvey | 8 | 70 |
| Haskell | 14 | 23 |
| Hodge-man | 22 | 14 |
| Jackson | 10 | 54 |
| Jefferson | 8 | 41 |
| Jewell | 22 | 12 |
| Johnson | 4 | 65 |
| Kearny | 17 | 23 |
| Kingman | 10 | 38 |
| Kiowa | 14 | 17 |
| Labette | 13 | 75 |
| Lane | 8 | 31 |
| Leaven-worth | 9 | 66 |
| Lincoln | 18 | 14 |
| Linn | 17 | 30 |
| Logan | 11 | 20 |
| Lyon | 8 | 52 |
| Marion | 13 | 23 |
| Marshall | 16 | 28 |

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC |
|---------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| McPher-son | 9 | 28 |
| Meade | 10 | 24 |
| Miami | 7 | 65 |
| Mitchell | 10 | 33 |
| Montgom-ery | 13 | 66 |
| Morris | 17 | 30 |
| Morton | 12 | 46 |
| Nemaha | 21 | 13 |
| Neosho | 10 | 59 |
| Ness | 8 | 23 |
| Norton | 17 | 18 |
| Osage | 10 | 46 |
| Osborne | 20 | 31 |
| Ottawa | 11 | 34 |
| Pawnee | 7 | 47 |
| Phillips | 8 | 43 |
| Pottawa-tomie | 12 | 45 |
| Pratt | 9 | 49 |
| Rawlins | 17 | 17 |
| Reno | 10 | 48 |
| Republic | 14 | 25 |
| Rice | 10 | 49 |
| Riley | 14 | 28 |
| Rooks | 10 | 20 |
| Rush | 12 | 28 |
| Russell | 13 | 38 |
| Saline | 8 | 78 |
| Scott | 11 | 19 |
| Sedgwick | 12 | 80 |
| Seward | 12 | 56 |
| Shawnee | 9 | 101 |
| Sheridan | 19 | 5 |
| Sherman | 12 | 68 |
| Smith | 18 | 16 |
| Stafford ... | 13 | 23 |
| Stanton | 18 | 18 |
| Stevens | 7 | 50 |
| Sumner | 8 | 53 |
| Thomas | 9 | 29 |
| Trego | 10 | 26 |
| Wabaun-see | 9 | 32 |
| Wallace | 15 | 4 |
| Washing-ton | 22 | 15 |
| Wichita | 19 | 39 |
| Wilson | 17 | 41 |

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty
Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC |
|------------------------|--|--|
| Woodson..... | 11 | 19 |
| Wyan- dotte..... | 19 | 106 |
| Kentucky: | | |
| Adair | 33 | 35 |
| Allen..... | 20 | 28 |
| Anderson .. | 11 | 48 |
| Ballard | 14 | 52 |
| Barren..... | 21 | 36 |
| Bath..... | 32 | 38 |
| Bell | 39 | 49 |
| Boone..... | 8 | 57 |
| Bourbon | 24 | 45 |
| Boyd..... | 17 | 49 |
| Boyle..... | 18 | 42 |
| Bracken..... | 18 | 39 |
| Breathitt.... | 41 | 49 |
| Breckin- ridge..... | 26 | 46 |
| Bullitt..... | 11 | 44 |
| Butler..... | 21 | 37 |
| Caldwell | 13 | 52 |
| Calloway | 16 | 26 |
| Campbell.... | 13 | 78 |
| Carlisle..... | 20 | 41 |
| Carroll..... | 23 | 54 |
| Carter..... | 32 | 32 |
| Casey..... | 43 | 29 |
| Christian.... | 28 | 49 |
| Clark | 20 | 52 |
| Clay | 49 | 46 |
| Clinton | 50 | 27 |
| Critten- den | 21 | 25 |
| Cumber- land..... | 35 | 42 |
| Daviess..... | 14 | 61 |
| Edmonson.. | 25 | 30 |
| Elliott..... | 37 | 30 |
| Estill..... | 34 | 44 |
| Fayette | 17 | 70 |
| Fleming..... | 26 | 31 |
| Floyd | 28 | 36 |
| Franklin | 12 | 63 |
| Fulton | 35 | 70 |
| Gallatin..... | 18 | 39 |
| Garrard..... | 24 | 27 |
| Grant..... | 14 | 39 |
| Graves..... | 15 | 48 |

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty
Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC |
|-----------------------|--|--|
| Grayson..... | 25 | 35 |
| Green..... | 28 | 23 |
| Greenup..... | 15 | 50 |
| Hancock..... | 15 | 32 |
| Hardin..... | 17 | 32 |
| Harlan..... | 31 | 49 |
| Harrison | 23 | 44 |
| Hart..... | 32 | 42 |
| Hender- son..... | 13 | 69 |
| Henry | 22 | 39 |
| Hickman.... | 21 | 66 |
| Hopkins | 17 | 39 |
| Jackson | 44 | 35 |
| Jefferson | 16 | 88 |
| Jessamine.. | 17 | 46 |
| Johnson..... | 27 | 45 |
| Kenton | 13 | 74 |
| Knott..... | 36 | 47 |
| Knox..... | 44 | 45 |
| Larue..... | 26 | 27 |
| Laurel..... | 25 | 41 |
| Lawrence .. | 35 | 38 |
| Lee | 41 | 48 |
| Leslie | 39 | 47 |
| Letcher..... | 34 | 36 |
| Lewis | 39 | 30 |
| Lincoln..... | 33 | 40 |
| Living- ston | 14 | 38 |
| Logan | 16 | 67 |
| Lyon | 13 | 33 |
| Madison | 26 | 41 |
| Magoffin | 41 | 47 |
| Marion | 26 | 47 |
| Marshall | 10 | 30 |
| Martin..... | 31 | 38 |
| Mason..... | 23 | 34 |
| McCracken.. | 16 | 74 |
| McCreary.... | 46 | 35 |
| McLean | 15 | 45 |
| Meade..... | 15 | 28 |
| Menifee | 29 | 37 |
| Mercer..... | 20 | 31 |
| Metcalfe..... | 32 | 20 |
| Monroe..... | 31 | 41 |
| Montgom- ery..... | 27 | 41 |
| Morgan..... | 42 | 32 |

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC |
|------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Muhlenberg..... | 17 | 51 |
| Nelson..... | 19 | 42 |
| Nicholas..... | 24 | 27 |
| Ohio..... | 18 | 40 |
| Oldham..... | 7 | 39 |
| Owen..... | 28 | 37 |
| Owsley..... | 58 | 44 |
| Pendleton.. | 21 | 34 |
| Perry..... | 27 | 39 |
| Pike..... | 23 | 31 |
| Powell..... | 30 | 51 |
| Pulaski..... | 26 | 36 |
| Robertson.. | 30 | 23 |
| Rockcastle..... | 38 | 36 |
| Rowan..... | 25 | 46 |
| Russell..... | 40 | 34 |
| Scott..... | 15 | 54 |
| Shelby..... | 15 | 50 |
| Simpson..... | 18 | 67 |
| Spencer..... | 23 | 34 |
| Taylor..... | 22 | 31 |
| Todd..... | 23 | 46 |
| Trigg..... | 16 | 50 |
| Trimble..... | 11 | 42 |
| Union..... | 11 | 52 |
| Warren..... | 16 | 41 |
| Washington..... | 28 | 35 |
| Wayne..... | 39 | 36 |
| Webster..... | 20 | 39 |
| Whitley..... | 32 | 43 |
| Wolfe..... | 38 | 57 |
| Woodford... | 13 | 49 |
| Louisiana: | | |
| Acadia..... | 26 | 36 |
| Allen..... | 24 | 43 |
| Ascension... | 19 | 46 |
| Assumption..... | 24 | 35 |
| Avoyelles... | 35 | 35 |
| Beauregard..... | 19 | 31 |
| Bienville.... | 29 | 35 |
| Bossier..... | 15 | 25 |
| Caddo..... | 21 | 46 |
| Calcasieu... | 15 | 46 |
| Caldwell..... | 27 | 35 |

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Cameron..... | 16 | 6 |
| Catahoula.. | 34 | 35 |
| Claiborne... | 34 | 44 |
| Concordia... | 35 | 44 |
| De Soto..... | 27 | 45 |
| East Baton Rouge..... | 18 | 51 |
| East Carroll.... | 52 | 66 |
| East Feliciana..... | 29 | 58 |
| Evangeline..... | 31 | 56 |
| Franklin..... | 36 | 54 |
| Grant..... | 24 | 31 |
| Iberia..... | 20 | 41 |
| Iberville..... | 29 | 58 |
| Jackson..... | 22 | 67 |
| Jefferson..... | 12 | 52 |
| Jefferson Davis..... | 22 | 30 |
| La Salle..... | 22 | 28 |
| Lafayette... | 14 | 50 |
| Lafourche.. | 15 | 27 |
| Lincoln..... | 21 | 52 |
| Livingston..... | 15 | 24 |
| Madison..... | 54 | 54 |
| Morehouse..... | 40 | 50 |
| Natchitoches..... | 30 | 34 |
| Orleans..... | 38 | 69 |
| Ouachita.... | 27 | 40 |
| Plaquemines..... | 16 | 39 |
| Pointe Coupee.... | 31 | 53 |
| Rapides..... | 22 | 41 |
| Red River... | 33 | 44 |
| Richland.... | 42 | 38 |
| Sabine..... | 26 | 29 |
| St. Bernard.. | 11 | 33 |
| St. Charles... | 17 | 56 |
| St. Helena... | 37 | 52 |
| St. James... | 21 | N/A |

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty
Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC |
|------------------------|--|--|
| St. John | | |
| The Baptist.... | 17 | 96 |
| St. Landry.... | 32 | 52 |
| St. Martin.. | 24 | 38 |
| St. Mary.... | 20 | 44 |
| St. Tamma- ny | 14 | 33 |
| Tangipa- hoa | 32 | 51 |
| Tensas | 51 | 55 |
| Terre- bonne | 18 | 30 |
| Union | 24 | 30 |
| Vermilion .. | 19 | 27 |
| Vernon | 21 | 22 |
| Washing- ton | 29 | 47 |
| Webster | 25 | 36 |
| West | | |
| Baton | | |
| Rouge | 21 | 60 |
| West | | |
| Carroll | 34 | 29 |
| West | | |
| Feli- ciana | 41 | 39 |
| Winn | 31 | 41 |
| Maine: | | |
| Andros- coggin | 16 | 87 |
| Aroostook .. | 19 | 64 |
| Cumber- land | 13 | 105 |
| Franklin | 13 | 83 |
| Hancock | 17 | 64 |
| Kennebec ... | 14 | 80 |
| Knox | 17 | 81 |
| Lincoln | 21 | 50 |
| Oxford | 16 | 85 |
| Penobscot... | 14 | 85 |
| Piscata- quis | 18 | 66 |
| Sagadahoc.. | 14 | 66 |
| Somerset | 19 | 78 |
| Waldo | 24 | 63 |

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty
Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC |
|-----------------------|--|--|
| Washing- ton | 26 | 60 |
| York | 12 | 93 |
| Maryland: | | |
| Allegany | 15 | 50 |
| Anne | | |
| Arundel .. | 8 | 77 |
| Baltimore... | 6 | 61 |
| Baltimore | | |
| City | 32 | 134 |
| Calvert | 12 | 85 |
| Caroline | 14 | 78 |
| Carroll | 5 | 56 |
| Cecil | 9 | 73 |
| Charles | 10 | 74 |
| Dorches- ter | 18 | 78 |
| Frederick ... | 7 | 43 |
| Garrett | 17 | 42 |
| Harford | 9 | 76 |
| Howard | 4 | 37 |
| Kent | 14 | 59 |
| Montgom- ery | 5 | 73 |
| Prince | | |
| George's.. | 8 | 92 |
| Queen | | |
| Anne's | 11 | 65 |
| Somerset | 19 | 58 |
| St. Mary's .. | 12 | 63 |
| Talbot | 13 | 52 |
| Washing- ton | 13 | 33 |
| Wicomico ... | 15 | 74 |
| Worcester .. | 16 | 37 |
| Massachu- setts: | | |
| Barnsta- ble | 13 | 105 |
| Berkshire... | 12 | 112 |
| Bristol | 14 | 118 |
| Dukes | 11 | 76 |
| Essex | 13 | 137 |
| Franklin | 12 | 91 |
| Hampden... | 18 | 126 |
| Hamp- shire | 10 | 78 |
| Middlesex .. | 9 | 94 |

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty
Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC |
|------------------------------|--|--|
| Nantuck- et | 5 | 140 |
| Norfolk..... | 7 | 102 |
| Plymouth... | 10 | 128 |
| Suffolk..... | 29 | 150 |
| Worcester .. | 12 | 117 |
| Michigan: | | |
| Alcona | 21 | 62 |
| Alger | 14 | 100 |
| Allegan | 10 | 105 |
| Alpena..... | 11 | 106 |
| Antrim | 11 | 86 |
| Arenac..... | 18 | 87 |
| Baraga..... | 11 | 120 |
| Barry | 10 | 98 |
| Bay..... | 11 | 105 |
| Benzie..... | 15 | 84 |
| Berrien..... | 19 | 109 |
| Branch | 14 | 76 |
| Calhoun | 14 | 135 |
| Cass | 13 | 93 |
| Charle- voix | 12 | 71 |
| Cheboy- gan | 18 | 70 |
| Chippewa... | 17 | 91 |
| Clare..... | 21 | 91 |
| Clinton | 6 | 99 |
| Crawford.... | 15 | 107 |
| Delta..... | 13 | 76 |
| Dickinson... | 8 | 92 |
| Eaton..... | 6 | 90 |
| Emmet | 11 | 75 |
| Genesee..... | 14 | 126 |
| Gladwin | 19 | 86 |
| Gogebic | 14 | 106 |
| Grand Tra- verse | 8 | 89 |
| Gratiot | 13 | 84 |
| Hillsdale | 12 | 84 |
| Houghton... | 14 | 117 |
| Huron..... | 14 | 49 |
| Ingham..... | 13 | 139 |
| Ionia | 10 | 113 |
| Iosco..... | 14 | 77 |
| Iron..... | 15 | 87 |
| Isabella..... | 14 | 96 |
| Jackson | 12 | 111 |

TABLE F-4--Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty
Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC ¹ |
|------------------------|--|---|
| Kalama- zoo | 12 | 123 |
| Kalkaska ... | 17 | 90 |
| Kent..... | 11 | 114 |
| Keweenaw.. | 14 | 114 |
| Lake..... | 32 | 86 |
| Lapeer | 8 | 98 |
| Leelanau.... | 8 | 64 |
| Lenawee..... | 10 | 102 |
| Living- ston | 5 | 96 |
| Luce..... | 14 | 89 |
| Mackinac ... | 17 | 87 |
| Macomb | 6 | 121 |
| Manistee.... | 12 | 83 |
| Marquette.. | 10 | 94 |
| Mason..... | 14 | 0 |
| Mecosta..... | 16 | 83 |
| Menomi- nee | 9 | 105 |
| Midland | 9 | 115 |
| Missaukee.. | 16 | 79 |
| Monroe..... | 8 | 97 |
| Montcalm .. | 13 | 82 |
| Montmor- ency | 23 | 67 |
| Muskegon .. | 18 | 115 |
| Newaygo | 17 | 88 |
| Oakland | 7 | 111 |
| Oceana | 15 | 97 |
| Ogemaw | 20 | 86 |
| Ontona- gon | 15 | 91 |
| Osceola..... | 17 | 79 |
| Oscoda | 19 | 76 |
| Otsego | 11 | 52 |
| Ottawa | 6 | 71 |
| Presque Isle | 17 | 45 |
| Roscom- mon..... | 13 | 119 |
| Saginaw | 16 | 123 |
| Sanilac | 13 | 89 |
| School- craft | 17 | 80 |
| Shiawas- see | 9 | 102 |
| St. Clair..... | 12 | 118 |
| St. Joseph .. | 13 | 90 |
| Tuscola..... | 10 | 97 |

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC |
|------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Van Buren..... | 18 | 120 |
| Wash-tenaw..... | 9 | 119 |
| Wayne..... | 20 | 136 |
| Wexford..... | 15 | 85 |
| Minnesota: | | |
| Aitkin..... | 21 | 39 |
| Anoka..... | 5 | 117 |
| Becker..... | 18 | 43 |
| Beltrami..... | 20 | 78 |
| Benton..... | 12 | 35 |
| Björk Stone .. | 16 | 29 |
| Blue Earth..... | 10 | 68 |
| Brown..... | 11 | 37 |
| Carlton..... | 9 | 88 |
| Carver..... | 6 | 55 |
| Cass..... | 23 | 61 |
| Chippewa... | 16 | 29 |
| Chisago..... | 7 | 80 |
| Clay..... | 8 | 66 |
| Clearwater..... | 23 | 62 |
| Cook..... | 12 | 54 |
| Cottonwood..... | 15 | 28 |
| Crow Wing..... | 19 | 37 |
| Dakota..... | 4 | 103 |
| Dodge..... | 10 | 38 |
| Douglas..... | 15 | 32 |
| Fairbault .. | 14 | n/a |
| Fillmore..... | 19 | 16 |
| Freeborn..... | 10 | 45 |
| Goodhue..... | 8 | 50 |
| Grant..... | 16 | 21 |
| Hennepin... | 8 | 138 |
| Houston..... | 13 | 28 |
| Hubbard..... | 22 | 47 |
| Isanti..... | 7 | 59 |
| Itasca..... | 12 | 89 |
| Jackson..... | 18 | 22 |
| Kanabec..... | 18 | 40 |
| Kandiyohi.. | 10 | 49 |
| Kittson..... | 13 | 28 |
| Koochiching..... | 13 | 71 |

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Lac qui Parle..... | 18 | 13 |
| Lake..... | 4 | 120 |
| Lake Of The Woods..... | 20 | 25 |
| Le Sueur.... | 10 | 40 |
| Lincoln..... | 29 | 22 |
| Lyon..... | 13 | n/a |
| Mahnomen..... | 30 | 29 |
| Marshall.... | 18 | 18 |
| Martin..... | 10 | 34 |
| McLeod..... | 8 | 42 |
| Meeker..... | 15 | 29 |
| Mille Lacs.. | 11 | 72 |
| Morrison.... | 23 | 27 |
| Mower..... | 12 | 48 |
| Murray..... | 22 | n/a |
| Nicollet..... | 10 | 38 |
| Nobles..... | 15 | 33 |
| Norman..... | 19 | 15 |
| Olmsted..... | 5 | 86 |
| Otter Tail .. | 17 | 22 |
| Pennington..... | 12 | 41 |
| Pine..... | 16 | 56 |
| Pipestone... | 24 | 15 |
| Polk..... | 13 | 54 |
| Pope..... | 20 | 22 |
| Ramsey..... | 10 | 128 |
| Red Lake.... | 21 | 10 |
| Redwood.... | 18 | 19 |
| Renville..... | 15 | 21 |
| Rice..... | 8 | 58 |
| Rock..... | 19 | 13 |
| Roseau..... | 17 | 22 |
| Scott..... | 5 | 72 |
| Sherburne.. | 8 | 66 |
| Sibley..... | 14 | 18 |
| St. Louis.... | 9 | 120 |
| Stearns..... | 11 | 36 |
| Steele..... | 8 | 35 |
| Stevens..... | 18 | 16 |
| Swift..... | 19 | 34 |
| Todd..... | 23 | 21 |
| Traverse..... | 22 | 18 |
| Wabasha.... | 11 | 34 |
| Wadena..... | 19 | 33 |
| Waseca..... | 8 | 52 |

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Washing- ton..... | 5 | 84 |
| Waton- wan..... | 13 | n/a |
| Wilkin..... | 12 | 32 |
| Winona..... | 9 | 69 |
| Wright..... | 7 | 71 |
| Yellow Medi- cine..... | 20 | 18 |
| Mississippi: | | |
| Adams..... | 36 | 62 |
| Alcorn..... | 20 | 26 |
| Amite..... | 34 | 31 |
| Attala..... | 38 | 35 |
| Benton..... | 31 | 51 |
| Bolivar..... | 52 | 59 |
| Calhoun..... | 27 | 46 |
| Carroll..... | 35 | 47 |
| Chicka- saw..... | 24 | 43 |
| Choctaw..... | 32 | 47 |
| Claiborne..... | 40 | 61 |
| Clarke..... | 24 | 49 |
| Clay..... | 31 | 61 |
| Coahoma..... | 51 | 59 |
| Copiah..... | 35 | 56 |
| Covington..... | 35 | 50 |
| De Soto..... | 20 | 34 |
| Forrest..... | 26 | 47 |
| Franklin..... | 37 | 41 |
| George..... | 19 | 35 |
| Greene..... | 26 | 29 |
| Grenada..... | 29 | 62 |
| Hancock..... | 24 | 39 |
| Harrison..... | 22 | 45 |
| Hinds..... | 25 | 77 |
| Holmes..... | 59 | 80 |
| Hum- phreys..... | 56 | 57 |
| Issaquena..... | 45 | 61 |
| Itawamba..... | 15 | 16 |
| Jackson..... | 15 | 27 |
| Jasper..... | 33 | 45 |
| Jefferson..... | 51 | 67 |
| Jefferson Davis..... | 34 | 62 |
| Jones..... | 21 | 50 |
| Kemper..... | 45 | 29 |

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Lafayette ... | 19 | 51 |
| Lamar..... | 18 | 43 |
| Lauder- dale..... | 28 | 51 |
| Lawrence..... | 22 | 48 |
| Leake..... | 37 | 37 |
| Lee..... | 19 | 36 |
| Leflore..... | 45 | 57 |
| Lincoln..... | 27 | 45 |
| Lowndes..... | 30 | 52 |
| Madison..... | 38 | 63 |
| Marion..... | 31 | 38 |
| Marshall..... | 40 | 58 |
| Monroe..... | 27 | 40 |
| Montgom- ery..... | 36 | 74 |
| Neshoba..... | 27 | 44 |
| Newton..... | 27 | 35 |
| Noxubee..... | 54 | 53 |
| Oktibbeha.. | 31 | 62 |
| Panola..... | 43 | 46 |
| Pearl River..... | 26 | 38 |
| Perry..... | 27 | 58 |
| Pike..... | 36 | 53 |
| Pontotoc..... | 21 | 34 |
| Prentiss..... | 16 | 28 |
| Quitman..... | 54 | 41 |
| Rankin..... | 14 | 17 |
| Scott..... | 33 | 30 |
| Sharkey..... | 52 | 71 |
| Simpson..... | 23 | 36 |
| Smith..... | 26 | 30 |
| Stone..... | 25 | 42 |
| Sunflower .. | 51 | 50 |
| Tallahat- chie..... | 55 | 57 |
| Tate..... | 31 | 66 |
| Tippah..... | 25 | 44 |
| Tisho- mingo..... | 12 | 23 |
| Tunica..... | 63 | 58 |
| Union..... | 22 | 31 |
| Walthall..... | 35 | 66 |
| Warren..... | 24 | 69 |
| Washing- ton..... | 42 | 59 |
| Wayne..... | 34 | 52 |
| Webster..... | 21 | 63 |
| Wilkinson .. | 45 | 59 |

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty
Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC |
|---------------------|--|--|
| Winston | 31 | 54 |
| Yalobusha.. | 30 | 44 |
| Yazoo..... | 47 | 59 |
| Missouri: | | |
| Adair | 14 | 34 |
| Andrew | 9 | 1 |
| Atchison..... | 15 | 23 |
| Audrain | 15 | 31 |
| Barry | 15 | 38 |
| Barton | 17 | 18 |
| Bates..... | 18 | 32 |
| Benton..... | 19 | 33 |
| Bollinger.... | 23 | 34 |
| Boone..... | 8 | 63 |
| Buchanan .. | 14 | 60 |
| Butler | 28 | 52 |
| Caldwell | 15 | 25 |
| Callaway | 9 | 47 |
| Camden..... | 17 | 33 |
| Cape Girar- | | |
| deau | 11 | 52 |
| Carroll..... | 19 | 38 |
| Carter | 31 | 30 |
| Cass | 9 | 33 |
| Cedar | 18 | 33 |
| Chariton..... | 17 | 41 |
| Christian.... | 13 | 37 |
| Clark | 16 | 31 |
| Clay | 6 | 43 |
| Clinton | 8 | 42 |
| Cole..... | 6 | 50 |
| Cooper | 11 | 44 |
| Crawford.... | 20 | 39 |
| Dade | 16 | 26 |
| Dallas | 21 | 27 |
| Daviess..... | 23 | 19 |
| De Kalb..... | 18 | 15 |
| Dent..... | 22 | 44 |
| Douglas | 25 | 21 |
| Dunklin..... | 28 | 70 |
| Franklin | 10 | 41 |
| Gascon- | | |
| ade | 13 | 23 |
| Gentry | 17 | 19 |
| Greene..... | 14 | 55 |
| Grundy..... | 20 | 21 |
| Harrison | 20 | 27 |
| Henry | 14 | 44 |

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty
Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC |
|---------------------|--|--|
| Hickory | 35 | 24 |
| Holt | 17 | 32 |
| Howard | 15 | 68 |
| Howell..... | 23 | 29 |
| Iron | 21 | 39 |
| Jackson | 14 | 95 |
| Jasper..... | 16 | 42 |
| Jefferson ... | 7 | 45 |
| Johnson..... | 12 | 33 |
| Knox..... | 30 | 11 |
| Laclede..... | 20 | 38 |
| Lafayette ... | 12 | 34 |
| Lawrence ... | 15 | 34 |
| Lewis | 14 | 37 |
| Lincoln | 12 | 27 |
| Linn | 15 | 45 |
| Living- | | |
| ston | 17 | 31 |
| Macon..... | 13 | 23 |
| Madison | 22 | 42 |
| Maries | 17 | 31 |
| Marion | 13 | 53 |
| McDonald .. | 25 | 31 |
| Mercer..... | 20 | 23 |
| Miller | 14 | 38 |
| Mississip- | | |
| pi | 35 | 83 |
| Moniteau ... | 16 | 21 |
| Monroe..... | 20 | 23 |
| Montgom- | | |
| ery | 15 | 40 |
| Morgan..... | 20 | 24 |
| New | | |
| Madrid.... | 34 | 72 |
| Newton..... | 15 | 28 |
| Nodaway | 18 | 18 |
| Oregon | 34 | 23 |
| Osage..... | 11 | 16 |
| Ozark..... | 28 | 26 |
| Pemiscot | 46 | 75 |
| Perry | 12 | 28 |
| Pettis..... | 13 | 62 |
| Phelps | 12 | 51 |
| Pike | 22 | 31 |
| Platte..... | 5 | 48 |
| Polk | 18 | 28 |
| Pulaski..... | 16 | 29 |
| Putnam | 21 | 12 |
| Ralls | 8 | 37 |
| Randolph ... | 16 | 38 |

005 237

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty
Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC |
|------------------------------|--|--|
| Ray | 9 | 44 |
| Reynolds | 26 | 26 |
| Ripley | 37 | 38 |
| Saline | 12 | 48 |
| Schuyler | 22 | 23 |
| Scotland | 23 | 7 |
| Scott | 20 | 63 |
| Shannon | 28 | 31 |
| Shelby | 19 | 24 |
| St. Charles ... | 5 | 51 |
| St. Clair | 24 | 40 |
| St. Fran- cois | 17 | 50 |
| St. Louis | 6 | 82 |
| St. Louis City | 33 | 121 |
| Ste. Gene- vieve | 13 | 28 |
| Stoddard | 17 | 54 |
| Stone | 25 | 17 |
| Sullivan | 23 | 30 |
| Taney | 19 | 36 |
| Texas | 24 | 27 |
| Vernon | 14 | 52 |
| Warren | 12 | 0 |
| Washing- ton | 23 | 54 |
| Wayne | 29 | 36 |
| Webster | 19 | 19 |
| Worth | 27 | 24 |
| Wright | 26 | 26 |
| Montana: | | |
| Beaver- head | 13 | 35 |
| Big Horn | 24 | 26 |
| Blaine | 29 | 42 |
| Broad- water | 18 | 16 |
| Carbon | 12 | 28 |
| Carter | 33 | 4 |
| Cascade | 13 | 51 |
| Chouteau ... | 15 | 9 |
| Custer | 15 | 24 |
| Daniels | 18 | 9 |
| Dawson | 6 | 38 |

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty
Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC |
|-----------------------------|--|--|
| Deer | | |
| Lodge | 12 | 62 |
| Fallon | 22 | 12 |
| Fergus | 21 | 12 |
| Flathead ... | 10 | 40 |
| Gallatin | 10 | 23 |
| Garfield | 31 | 3 |
| Glacier | 29 | 54 |
| Golden Valley | 22 | 6 |
| Granite | 21 | 25 |
| Hill | 17 | 47 |
| Jefferson | 6 | 47 |
| Judith Basin | 27 | 10 |
| Lake | 22 | 24 |
| Lewis And Clark | 9 | 58 |
| Liberty | 18 | 7 |
| Lincoln | 11 | 61 |
| Madison | 15 | 13 |
| McCone | 25 | 0 |
| Meagher | 18 | 19 |
| Mineral | 15 | 29 |
| Missoula | 11 | 58 |
| Mussel- shell | 20 | 28 |
| Park | 8 | 54 |
| Petroleum .. | 45 | 5 |
| Phillips | 19 | 13 |
| Pondera | 15 | 52 |
| Powder River | 12 | 7 |
| Powell | 14 | 37 |
| Prairie | 39 | 1 |
| Ravalli | 16 | 24 |
| Richland | 12 | 25 |
| Roosevelt ... | 22 | 39 |
| Rosebud | 21 | 38 |
| Sanders | 10 | 57 |
| Sheridan | 16 | 13 |
| Silver Bow | 11 | 71 |
| Stillwater ... | 14 | 22 |
| Sweet Grass | 18 | 11 |
| Teton | 13 | 25 |
| Toole | 21 | 21 |
| Treasure | 26 | 13 |

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC |
|-------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Valley..... | 17 | 40 |
| Wheat-land..... | 18 | 22 |
| Wibaux..... | 20 | 19 |
| Yellow-stone..... | 11 | 50 |
| Nebraska: | | |
| Adams..... | 8 | 47 |
| Antelope | 25 | 5 |
| Arthur..... | 26 | 0 |
| Banner..... | 30 | 11 |
| Blaine..... | 34 | 12 |
| Boone..... | 23 | 8 |
| Box Butte... | 7 | 47 |
| Boyd..... | 26 | 13 |
| Brown..... | 22 | 7 |
| Buffalo..... | 8 | 37 |
| Burt..... | 20 | 21 |
| Butler..... | 12 | 8 |
| Cass..... | 8 | 32 |
| Cedar..... | 25 | 6 |
| Chase..... | 17 | 20 |
| Cherry..... | 17 | 16 |
| Cheyenne... | 12 | 23 |
| Clay..... | 12 | 37 |
| Colfax..... | 15 | 11 |
| Cuming..... | 15 | 5 |
| Custer..... | 16 | 19 |
| Dakota..... | 10 | 0 |
| Dawes..... | 12 | 40 |
| Dawson..... | 10 | 39 |
| Deuel..... | 15 | 48 |
| Dixon..... | 23 | 13 |
| Dodge..... | 10 | 26 |
| Douglas..... | 12 | 93 |
| Dundy..... | 20 | 7 |
| Fillmore..... | 12 | 21 |
| Franklin.... | 19 | 21 |
| Frontier.... | 18 | 8 |
| Furnas..... | 22 | 12 |
| Gage..... | 11 | 45 |
| Garden..... | 14 | 4 |
| Garfield..... | 20 | 27 |
| Gosper..... | 15 | 22 |
| Grant..... | 16 | 9 |
| Greeley..... | 33 | 9 |
| Hall..... | 6 | 69 |
| Hamilton... | 13 | 21 |
| Harlan..... | 21 | 24 |

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC |
|-------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Hayes..... | 26 | 2 |
| Hitchcock... | 19 | 19 |
| Holt..... | 21 | 10 |
| Hooker..... | 24 | 16 |
| Howard..... | 10 | 32 |
| Jefferson.... | 19 | 18 |
| Johnson..... | 23 | 13 |
| Kearney..... | 11 | 10 |
| Keith..... | 9 | 53 |
| Keya Paha..... | 21 | 5 |
| Kimball..... | 13 | 28 |
| Knox..... | 25 | 9 |
| Lancaster... | 8 | 74 |
| Lincoln..... | 8 | 58 |
| Logan..... | 30 | 11 |
| Loup..... | 12 | 30 |
| Madison..... | 8 | 36 |
| McPherson..... | 24 | 18 |
| Merrick..... | 13 | 24 |
| Morrill..... | 28 | 19 |
| Nance..... | 25 | 5 |
| Nemaha..... | 19 | 25 |
| Nuckolls..... | 9 | 26 |
| Otoe..... | 13 | 26 |
| Pawnee..... | 24 | 10 |
| Perkins..... | 20 | 11 |
| Phelps..... | 10 | 34 |
| Pierce..... | 15 | 9 |
| Platte..... | 9 | 14 |
| Polk..... | 16 | 6 |
| Red Willow.... | 11 | 14 |
| Richardson..... | 19 | 27 |
| Rock..... | 17 | 12 |
| Saline..... | 16 | 9 |
| Sarpy..... | 6 | 37 |
| Saunders.... | 11 | 21 |
| Scotts Bluff..... | 15 | 56 |
| Seward..... | 10 | 25 |
| Sheridan.... | 11 | 33 |
| Sherman.... | 24 | 8 |
| Sioux..... | 16 | 15 |
| Stanton..... | 19 | 3 |
| Thayer..... | 11 | 20 |
| Thomas..... | 9 | 7 |
| Thurston.... | 29 | 76 |

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty
Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC |
|------------------------|--|--|
| Valley..... | 22 | 10 |
| Washing- ton..... | 8 | 26 |
| Wayne..... | 20 | 7 |
| Webster..... | 14 | 28 |
| Wheeler..... | 25 | 4 |
| York..... | 10 | 30 |
| Nevada: | | |
| Carson City..... | 6 | 20 |
| Churchill .. | 12 | 22 |
| Clark..... | 11 | 42 |
| Douglas..... | 6 | 10 |
| Elko..... | 12 | 19 |
| Esmer- alda..... | 2 | 100 |
| Eureka..... | 34 | 2 |
| Humboldt .. | 17 | 20 |
| Lander..... | 18 | 15 |
| Lincoln..... | 9 | 27 |
| Lyon..... | 10 | 22 |
| Mineral..... | 14 | 28 |
| Nye..... | 14 | 3 |
| Pershing .. | 15 | 12 |
| Storey..... | 7 | 29 |
| Washoe..... | 6 | 16 |
| White Pine..... | 12 | 29 |
| New Hampshire: | | |
| Belknap..... | 12 | 53 |
| Carroll..... | 16 | 26 |
| Cheshire..... | 10 | 58 |
| Coos..... | 14 | 56 |
| Grafton..... | 11 | 52 |
| Hillsbor- ough..... | 8 | 67 |
| Merri- mack..... | 9 | 50 |
| Rocking- ham..... | 7 | 69 |
| Strafford .. | 10 | 69 |
| Sullivan..... | 14 | 40 |
| New Jersey: | | |
| Atlantic..... | 18 | 174 |
| Bergen..... | 5 | 62 |
| Burling- ton..... | 8 | 105 |

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty
Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC |
|----------------------|--|--|
| Camden..... | 18 | 127 |
| Cape May... | 12 | 100 |
| Cumber- land..... | 21 | 105 |
| Essex..... | 28 | 124 |
| Glouces- ter..... | 10 | 98 |
| Hudson..... | 27 | 106 |
| Hunter- don..... | 4 | 65 |
| Mercer..... | 13 | 160 |
| Middlesex .. | 8 | 128 |
| Mon- mouth..... | 10 | 118 |
| Morris..... | 4 | 62 |
| Ocean..... | 11 | 103 |
| Passaic..... | 21 | 106 |
| Salem..... | 16 | 86 |
| Somerset.... | 4 | 130 |
| Sussex..... | 6 | 69 |
| Union..... | 11 | 109 |
| Warren..... | 8 | 87 |
| New Mexico: | | |
| Bernalillo... | 16 | 52 |
| Catron..... | 24 | 14 |
| Chaves..... | 25 | 33 |
| Colfax..... | 19 | 46 |
| Curry..... | 20 | 50 |
| De Baca..... | 26 | 25 |
| Dona Ana .. | 28 | 26 |
| Eddy..... | 18 | 39 |
| Grant..... | 16 | 44 |
| Guada- lupe..... | 35 | 42 |
| Harding..... | 22 | 19 |
| Hidalgo..... | 21 | 40 |
| Lea..... | 16 | 44 |
| Lincoln..... | 22 | 34 |
| Los Alamos... | 1 | 6 |
| Luna..... | 20 | 30 |
| M. Kinley... | 43 | 33 |
| Mora..... | 43 | 36 |
| Otero..... | 18 | 29 |
| Quay..... | 22 | 41 |
| Rio Arriba.... | 31 | 38 |
| Roosevelt .. | 33 | 36 |
| San Juan .. | 24 | 31 |

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC |
|------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| San Miguel | 34 | 58 |
| Sandoval | 24 | 37 |
| Santa Fe | 15 | 51 |
| Sierra | 27 | 36 |
| Socorro | 33 | 34 |
| Taos | 31 | 44 |
| Torrance | 26 | 34 |
| Union | 27 | 26 |
| Valencia..... | 17 | 36 |
| New York: | | |
| Albany | 12 | 84 |
| Allegany | 18 | 61 |
| Bronx..... | 42 | n/a |
| Broome..... | 10 | 70 |
| Cattaraugus..... | 16 | 47 |
| Cayuga | 15 | 55 |
| Chautauqua | 14 | 81 |
| Chemung ... | 14 | 66 |
| Chenango... | 15 | 21 |
| Clinton | 14 | 58 |
| Columbia ... | 13 | 45 |
| Cortland..... | 14 | 65 |
| Delaware ... | 17 | 38 |
| Dutchess | 8 | 63 |
| Erie | 14 | 87 |
| Essex | 17 | 61 |
| Franklin | 20 | 55 |
| Fulton | 15 | 42 |
| Genesee..... | 12 | 41 |
| Greene..... | 15 | 41 |
| Hamilton ... | 18 | 37 |
| Herkimer... | 17 | 32 |
| Jefferson | 17 | 43 |
| Kings | 37 | n/a |
| Lewis | 16 | 30 |
| Livingston | 11 | 50 |
| Madison | 15 | 38 |
| Monroe | 11 | 99 |
| Montgomery | 13 | 50 |
| Nassau | 7 | 81 |
| New York .. | 36 | 96 |
| Niagara..... | 12 | 77 |
| Oneida..... | 14 | 72 |
| Onondaga .. | 11 | 88 |

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC |
|-------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Ontario..... | 8 | 60 |
| Orange | 13 | 83 |
| Orleans | 12 | 70 |
| Oswego | 13 | 59 |
| Otsego | 16 | 40 |
| Putnam | 3 | 72 |
| Queens | 17 | n/a |
| Rensselaer..... | 13 | 60 |
| Richmond .. | 11 | n/a |
| Rockland.... | 8 | 75 |
| Saratoga..... | 10 | 41 |
| Schenectady..... | 11 | 72 |
| Schoharie... | 15 | 41 |
| Schuyler..... | 12 | 36 |
| Seneca | 9 | 39 |
| St. Lawrence..... | 19 | 52 |
| Steuben | 16 | 50 |
| Suffolk..... | 8 | 81 |
| Sullivan | 18 | 52 |
| Tioga..... | 10 | 50 |
| Tompkins... | 13 | 63 |
| Ulster | 12 | 78 |
| Warren..... | 16 | 39 |
| Washington..... | 16 | 45 |
| Wayne | 11 | 54 |
| Westchester... | 10 | 117 |
| Wyoming ... | 11 | 25 |
| Yates | 19 | 25 |
| North Carolina: | | |
| Alamance .. | 13 | 38 |
| Alexander .. | 8 | 35 |
| Alleghany.. | 20 | 28 |
| Anson | 18 | 36 |
| Ashe..... | 25 | 19 |
| Avery..... | 20 | 11 |
| Beaufort..... | 26 | 36 |
| Bertie | 36 | 33 |
| Bladen | 30 | 49 |
| Brunswick | 24 | 27 |
| Buncombe.. | 15 | 30 |
| Burke | 11 | 29 |

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC |
|------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Cabarrus.... | 12 | 47 |
| Caldwell.... | 12 | 22 |
| Camden..... | 17 | 58 |
| Carteret | 16 | 42 |
| Caswell..... | 22 | 43 |
| Catawba | 9 | 39 |
| Chatham | 10 | 41 |
| Cherokee.... | 25 | 16 |
| Chowan..... | 30 | 33 |
| Clay..... | 25 | 12 |
| Cleveland... | 16 | 59 |
| Columbus... | 31 | 28 |
| Craven..... | 24 | 41 |
| Cumberland..... | 22 | 52 |
| Currituck... | 21 | 23 |
| Dare..... | 12 | 35 |
| Davidson.... | 13 | 33 |
| Davie..... | 12 | 30 |
| Duplin..... | 26 | 42 |
| Durham | 17 | 85 |
| Edgecombe | 26 | 58 |
| Forsyth..... | 15 | 78 |
| Franklin | 24 | 38 |
| Gaston..... | 13 | 53 |
| Gates..... | 26 | 32 |
| Graham..... | 19 | 11 |
| Granville ... | 18 | 33 |
| Greene..... | 34 | 42 |
| Guilford | 14 | 68 |
| Halifax..... | 38 | 63 |
| Harnett..... | 24 | 41 |
| Haywood.... | 18 | 24 |
| Henderson..... | 13 | 31 |
| Hertford.... | 30 | 30 |
| Hoke..... | 26 | 34 |
| Hyde..... | 36 | 23 |
| Iredell..... | 12 | 42 |
| Jackson | 19 | 20 |
| Johnston ... | 20 | 28 |
| Jones..... | 24 | 67 |
| Lee..... | 17 | 33 |
| Lenoir..... | 25 | 45 |
| Lincoln..... | 11 | 32 |
| Macon..... | 16 | 7 |
| Madison | 28 | 25 |
| Martin..... | 31 | 23 |
| McDowell... | 12 | 34 |

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC |
|-------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Mecklenburg | 14 | 79 |
| Mitchell | 18 | 26 |
| Montgomery | 16 | 36 |
| Moore..... | 17 | 38 |
| Nash..... | 26 | 45 |
| New Hanover..... | 19 | 52 |
| Northampton ... | 37 | 62 |
| Onslow..... | 21 | 19 |
| Orange..... | 11 | 43 |
| Pamlico..... | 25 | 35 |
| Pasquotank | 21 | 43 |
| Pender..... | 26 | 39 |
| Perquimans..... | 31 | 27 |
| Person..... | 21 | 44 |
| Pitt..... | 28 | 53 |
| Polk..... | 19 | 20 |
| Randolph ... | 10 | 15 |
| Richmond .. | 18 | 38 |
| Robeson..... | 31 | 51 |
| Rockingham..... | 15 | 40 |
| Rowan..... | 12 | 37 |
| Rutherford..... | 16 | 36 |
| Sampson | 25 | 34 |
| Scotland..... | 20 | 88 |
| Stanly..... | 12 | 37 |
| Stokes..... | 13 | 26 |
| Surry..... | 15 | 18 |
| Swain..... | 28 | 25 |
| Transylvania..... | 14 | 34 |
| Tyrrell..... | 26 | 55 |
| Union..... | 12 | 53 |
| Vance..... | 27 | 50 |
| Wake..... | 11 | 71 |
| Warren..... | 41 | 44 |
| Washington..... | 25 | 45 |
| Watauga | 18 | 23 |
| Wayne..... | 22 | 49 |
| Wilkes..... | 15 | 15 |
| Wilson..... | 27 | 38 |

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty
Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC |
|------------------------|--|--|
| Yadkin | 15 | 22 |
| Yancey | 27 | 11 |
| North Dakota: | | |
| Adams | 19 | 12 |
| Barnes | 15 | 25 |
| Benson | 30 | 72 |
| Billings | 30 | 5 |
| Bottineau | 12 | 27 |
| Bowman | 15 | 15 |
| Burke | 23 | 16 |
| Burleigh | 8 | 40 |
| Cass | 8 | 55 |
| Cavalier | 14 | 26 |
| Dickey | 21 | 14 |
| Divide | 9 | 32 |
| Dunn | 29 | 17 |
| Eddy | 15 | 41 |
| Emmons | 28 | 4 |
| Foster | 13 | 36 |
| Golden Valley | 16 | 13 |
| Grand Forks | 11 | 28 |
| Grant | 42 | 6 |
| Griggs | 12 | 24 |
| Hettinger | 29 | 6 |
| Kidder | 34 | 14 |
| La Moure | 20 | 11 |
| Logan | 29 | 6 |
| McHenry | 18 | 24 |
| McIntosh | 31 | 10 |
| McKenzie | 17 | 29 |
| McLean | 13 | 45 |
| Mercer | 11 | 20 |
| Morton | 11 | 28 |
| Mountrail | 21 | 41 |
| Nelson | 17 | 19 |
| Oliver | 15 | 6 |
| Pembina | 13 | 52 |
| Pierce | 17 | 23 |
| Ramsey | 10 | 37 |
| Ransom | 14 | 30 |
| Renville | 22 | 10 |
| Richland | 10 | 30 |
| Rolette | 37 | 87 |
| Sargent | 10 | 28 |
| Sheridan | 31 | 14 |
| Sioux | 37 | 46 |
| Slope | 27 | 3 |

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty
Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC |
|-----------------------|--|--|
| Stark | 13 | 12 |
| Steele | 13 | 20 |
| Stutsman | 13 | 36 |
| Towner | 20 | 28 |
| Traill | 8 | 25 |
| Walsh | 17 | 25 |
| Ward | 12 | 38 |
| Wells | 21 | 13 |
| Williams | 9 | 47 |
| Ohio: | | |
| Adams | 27 | 60 |
| Allen | 13 | 71 |
| Ashland | 11 | 36 |
| Ashtabula | 11 | 74 |
| Athens | 21 | 64 |
| Auglaize | 7 | 43 |
| Belmont | 11 | 71 |
| Brown | 18 | 40 |
| Butler | 11 | 86 |
| Carroll | 11 | 46 |
| Cham- paign | 13 | 49 |
| Clark | 15 | 84 |
| Clermont | 10 | 56 |
| Clinton | 12 | 53 |
| Colum- biana | 12 | 59 |
| Coshocton | 13 | 42 |
| Crawford | 14 | 51 |
| Cuyahoga | 16 | 114 |
| Darke | 11 | 38 |
| Defiance | 8 | 48 |
| Delaware | 7 | 53 |
| Erie | 10 | 69 |
| Fairfield | 8 | 50 |
| Fayette | 17 | 47 |
| Franklin | 15 | 103 |
| Fulton | 10 | 34 |
| Gallia | 16 | 61 |
| Geauga | 6 | 29 |
| Greene | 9 | 71 |
| Guernsey | 16 | 36 |
| Hamilton | 15 | 88 |
| Hancock | 7 | 53 |
| Hardin | 16 | 30 |
| Harrison | 13 | 41 |
| Henry | 6 | 50 |
| Highland | 18 | 41 |
| Hocking | 15 | 65 |

SBS 243

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty
Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC |
|---------------------|--|--|
| Holmes | 23 | 6 |
| Huron | 8 | 43 |
| Jackson | 20 | 85 |
| Jefferson | 13 | 87 |
| Knox | 14 | 45 |
| Lake | 5 | 59 |
| Lawrence | 18 | 76 |
| Licking | 9 | 76 |
| Logan | 12 | 47 |
| Lorain | 11 | 66 |
| Lucas | 15 | 96 |
| Madison | 11 | 61 |
| Mahoning | 16 | 94 |
| Marion | 14 | 75 |
| Medina | 5 | 27 |
| Meigs | 19 | 56 |
| Mercer | 8 | 40 |
| Miami | 9 | 61 |
| Monroe | 14 | 33 |
| Montgomery | 15 | 97 |
| Morgan | 17 | 58 |
| Morrow | 12 | 49 |
| Muskingum | 15 | 58 |
| Noble | 13 | 39 |
| Ottawa | 8 | 65 |
| Paulding | 7 | 52 |
| Perry | 15 | 64 |
| Pickaway | 13 | 48 |
| Pike | 26 | 54 |
| Portage | 9 | 71 |
| Preble | 10 | 51 |
| Putnam | 8 | 36 |
| Richland | 12 | 70 |
| Ross | 14 | 81 |
| Sandusky | 10 | 50 |
| Scioto | 23 | 86 |
| Seneca | 10 | 40 |
| Shelby | 10 | 50 |
| Stark | 11 | 75 |
| Summit | 13 | 98 |
| Trumbull | 11 | 80 |
| Tuscarawas | 11 | 64 |
| Union | 9 | 62 |
| Van Wert | 7 | 51 |
| Vinton | 20 | 54 |
| Warren | 9 | 63 |

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty
Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC |
|-----------------------|--|--|
| Washing- ton | 11 | 63 |
| Wayne | 12 | 32 |
| Williams | 9 | 32 |
| Wood | 8 | 46 |
| Wyandot | 13 | 39 |
| Oklahoma: | | |
| Adair | 30 | 61 |
| Alfalfa | 14 | 24 |
| Atoka | 32 | 45 |
| Beaver | 18 | 2 |
| Beckham | 14 | 40 |
| Blaine | 19 | 33 |
| Bryan | 22 | 32 |
| Caddo | 25 | 47 |
| Canadian | 7 | 30 |
| Carter | 19 | 53 |
| Cherokee | 23 | 47 |
| Choctaw | 28 | 56 |
| Cimarron | 15 | 16 |
| Cleveland | 8 | 25 |
| Coal | 28 | 51 |
| Comanche | 18 | 36 |
| Cotton | 19 | 38 |
| Craig | 14 | 32 |
| Creek | 13 | 48 |
| Custer | 18 | 27 |
| Delaware | 28 | 41 |
| Dewey | 17 | 31 |
| Ellis | 9 | 20 |
| Garfield | 9 | 44 |
| Garvin | 14 | 36 |
| Grady | 15 | 30 |
| Grant | 14 | 11 |
| Greer | 31 | 43 |
| Harmon | 35 | 31 |
| Harper | 10 | 8 |
| Haskell | 20 | 62 |
| Hughes | 30 | 30 |
| Jackson | 22 | 46 |
| Jefferson | 21 | 19 |
| Johnston | 37 | 29 |
| Kay | 9 | 34 |
| Kingfish- er | 11 | 17 |
| Kiowa | 27 | 36 |
| Latimer | 27 | 43 |
| Le Flore | 25 | 42 |
| Lincoln | 14 | 37 |

244

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC |
|---------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Logan | 15 | 28 |
| Love | 17 | 35 |
| Major | 10 | 9 |
| Marshall | 26 | 37 |
| Mayes | 17 | 35 |
| McClain | 10 | 37 |
| McCur-tain | 28 | 54 |
| McIntosh.... | 29 | 45 |
| Murray | 17 | 34 |
| Muskogee.... | 23 | 50 |
| Noble | 11 | 45 |
| Nowata | 13 | 35 |
| Okfuskee.... | 24 | 56 |
| Oklahoma .. | 13 | 71 |
| Okmulgee .. | 24 | 58 |
| Osage | 11 | 45 |
| Ottawa | 20 | 37 |
| Pawnee | 16 | 31 |
| Payne | 13 | 22 |
| Pittsburg.... | 19 | 49 |
| Pontotoc.... | 18 | 32 |
| Pottawa-tomie | 15 | 46 |
| Pushma-taha | 29 | 34 |
| Roger Mills | 15 | 29 |
| Rogers | 8 | 32 |
| Seminole | 23 | 58 |
| Sequoyah ... | 24 | 41 |
| Stephens | 11 | 27 |
| Texas | 8 | 22 |
| Tillman | 28 | 48 |
| Tulsa | 13 | 57 |
| Wagoner | 11 | 51 |
| Washing-ton | 9 | 23 |
| Washita | 10 | 25 |
| Woods | 10 | 33 |
| Woodward.. | 9 | 12 |
| Oregon: | | |
| Baker | 13 | 71 |
| Benton | 10 | 70 |
| Clackamas | 6 | 95 |
| Clatsop | 11 | 79 |
| Columbia ... | 10 | 85 |
| Coos | 12 | 121 |

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC |
|-------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Crook | 11 | 82 |
| Curry | 16 | 65 |
| Deschutes .. | 9 | 75 |
| Douglas | 13 | 82 |
| Gilliam | 8 | 206 |
| Grant | 14 | 64 |
| Harney | 9 | 73 |
| Hood River | 9 | 51 |
| Jackson | 14 | 90 |
| Jefferson | 16 | 45 |
| Josephine.... | 20 | 81 |
| Klamath | 13 | 71 |
| Lake | 18 | 42 |
| Lane | 13 | 104 |
| Lincoln | 12 | 90 |
| Linn | 15 | 84 |
| Malheur | 23 | 52 |
| Marion | 12 | 84 |
| Morrow | 13 | 47 |
| Multnomah | 13 | 120 |
| Polk | 13 | 65 |
| Sherman | 19 | 0 |
| Tillamook .. | 11 | 95 |
| Umatilla | 12 | 64 |
| Union | 11 | 69 |
| Wallowa | 13 | 54 |
| Wasco | 11 | 64 |
| Washing-ton | 7 | 80 |
| Wheeler | 25 | 0 |
| Yamhill | 12 | 78 |
| Pennsylvania: | | |
| Adams | 10 | 44 |
| Allegheny .. | 12 | 120 |
| Armstrong | 12 | 69 |
| Beaver | 10 | 78 |
| Bedford | 18 | 40 |
| Berks | 11 | 72 |
| Blair | 14 | 65 |
| Bradford | 16 | 78 |
| Bucks | 7 | 83 |
| Butler | 8 | 75 |
| Cambria | 13 | 49 |
| Cameron | 15 | 62 |
| Carbon | 10 | 52 |
| Centre | 11 | 51 |

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty
Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC |
|------------------------|--|--|
| Chester..... | 7 | 98 |
| Clarion..... | 13 | 53 |
| Clearfield... | 13 | 59 |
| Clinton..... | 16 | 69 |
| Columbia... | 13 | 60 |
| Crawford.... | 14 | 62 |
| Cumber- land..... | 6 | 39 |
| Dauphin..... | 13 | 102 |
| Delaware... | 10 | 108 |
| Elk..... | 7 | 71 |
| Erie..... | 13 | 92 |
| Fayette..... | 21 | 89 |
| Forest..... | 16 | 47 |
| Franklin... | 8 | 51 |
| Fulton..... | 16 | 51 |
| Greene..... | 17 | 72 |
| Hunting- don..... | 17 | 60 |
| Indiana..... | 13 | 51 |
| Jefferson... | 12 | 39 |
| Juniata..... | 17 | 35 |
| Lacka- wanna..... | 13 | 77 |
| Lancaster... | 11 | 50 |
| Lawrence... | 13 | 85 |
| Lebanon..... | 10 | 48 |
| Lehigh..... | 10 | 72 |
| Luzerne..... | 14 | 76 |
| Lycoming... | 14 | 74 |
| McKean..... | 14 | 82 |
| Mercer..... | 12 | 70 |
| Mifflin..... | 17 | 59 |
| Monroe..... | 10 | 65 |
| Montgom- ery..... | 6 | 74 |
| Montour..... | 8 | 62 |
| North- ampton... | 10 | 79 |
| Northum- berland... | 14 | 50 |
| Perry..... | 10 | 59 |
| Philadel- phia..... | 29 | 137 |
| Pike..... | 11 | 41 |
| Potter..... | 19 | 63 |
| Schuylkill.. | 14 | 47 |
| Snyder..... | 14 | 30 |
| Somerset.... | 15 | 54 |
| Sullivan..... | 13 | 25 |

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty
Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC |
|------------------------|--|--|
| Susque- hanna..... | 17 | 46 |
| Tioga..... | 18 | 49 |
| Union..... | 10 | 40 |
| Venango..... | 10 | 95 |
| Warren..... | 11 | 58 |
| Washing- ton..... | 12 | 81 |
| Wayne..... | 17 | 42 |
| West- moreland.. | 9 | 86 |
| Wyoming... | 12 | 81 |
| York..... | 8 | 73 |
| Rhode Island: | | |
| Bristol..... | 7 | 92 |
| Kent..... | 9 | 103 |
| Newport.... | 13 | 82 |
| Provi- dence..... | 16 | 111 |
| Washing- ton..... | 8 | 98 |
| South Carolina: | | |
| Abbeville.... | 18 | 66 |
| Aiken..... | 16 | 59 |
| Allendale... | 38 | 85 |
| Anderson... | 14 | 34 |
| Bamberg.... | 34 | 77 |
| Barnwell.... | 24 | 88 |
| Beaufort.... | 22 | 64 |
| Berkeley.... | 17 | 42 |
| Calhoun..... | 27 | 75 |
| Charles- ton..... | 23 | 62 |
| Cherokee.... | 17 | 46 |
| Chester..... | 24 | 40 |
| Chester- field..... | 21 | 51 |
| Clarendon.. | 36 | 62 |
| Colleton.... | 32 | 57 |
| Darling- ton..... | 29 | 61 |
| Dillon..... | 38 | 48 |
| Dorches- ter..... | 14 | 54 |
| Edgefield.... | 34 | 38 |
| Fairfield.... | 26 | 60 |
| Florence.... | 28 | 1 |

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC |
|---------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| George-town..... | 27 | 60 |
| Greenville.. | 14 | 42 |
| Green-wood..... | 17 | 46 |
| Hampton.... | 36 | 71 |
| Horry..... | 24 | 51 |
| Jasper..... | 34 | 69 |
| Kershaw.... | 19 | 5 |
| Lancaster... | 13 | 44 |
| Laurens..... | 13 | 59 |
| Lee..... | 39 | 59 |
| Lexington .. | 11 | 34 |
| Marion | 33 | 45 |
| Marlboro.... | 31 | 17 |
| McCor-mick..... | 36 | 233 |
| Newberry... | 13 | 76 |
| Oconee..... | 16 | 16 |
| Orange-burg | 34 | 65 |
| Pickens..... | 10 | 32 |
| Richland ... | 19 | 59 |
| Saluda | 27 | 43 |
| Spartan-burg | 17 | 35 |
| Sumter | 29 | 55 |
| Union | 13 | 48 |
| Williams-burg | 34 | 2 |
| York | 14 | 42 |
| South Dakota: | | |
| Aurora..... | 30 | 9 |
| Beadle | 15 | 36 |
| Bennett | 41 | 49 |
| Bon Homme... | 27 | 15 |
| Brookings .. | 14 | 20 |
| Brown..... | 11 | 45 |
| Brule | 28 | 18 |
| Buffalo | 45 | 46 |
| Butte..... | 17 | 43 |
| Campbell... | 37 | 2 |
| Charles Mix..... | 34 | 33 |
| Clark | 34 | 5 |
| Clay | 15 | 34 |
| Codington .. | 10 | 44 |
| Corson | 51 | 33 |

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC |
|------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Custer..... | 17 | 23 |
| Davison | 15 | 45 |
| Day | 22 | 18 |
| Deuel..... | 27 | 6 |
| Dewey..... | 40 | 43 |
| Douglas | 34 | 7 |
| Edmunds.... | 31 | 8 |
| Fall River .. | 16 | 50 |
| Faulk | 40 | 4 |
| Grant..... | 14 | 18 |
| Gregory | 27 | 27 |
| Haakon | 23 | 11 |
| Hamlin..... | 32 | 6 |
| Hand..... | 38 | 3 |
| Hanson..... | 43 | 4 |
| Harding..... | 30 | 3 |
| Hughes..... | 7 | 97 |
| Hutchin-son..... | 30 | 6 |
| Hyde | 28 | 19 |
| Jackson | 43 | 4 |
| Jerauld..... | 23 | 9 |
| Jones | 20 | 25 |
| Kingsbury.. | 28 | 11 |
| Lake..... | 16 | 24 |
| Lawrence... | 14 | 43 |
| Lincoln | 11 | 26 |
| Lyman..... | 35 | 28 |
| Marshall ... | 30 | 15 |
| McCook..... | 21 | 19 |
| McPher-son..... | 35 | 7 |
| Meade..... | 11 | 30 |
| Mellette | 50 | 49 |
| Miner | 35 | 7 |
| Minneha-ha | 10 | 54 |
| Moody..... | 20 | 19 |
| Penning-ton..... | 14 | 68 |
| Perkins..... | 24 | 0 |
| Potter | 26 | 0 |
| Roberts..... | 32 | 29 |
| Sanborn | 41 | 10 |
| Shannon.... | 48 | 78 |
| Spink | 25 | 15 |
| Stanley..... | 14 | 54 |
| Sully..... | 25 | 6 |
| Todd..... | 50 | 64 |
| Tripp..... | 32 | 30 |

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty
Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC |
|----------------------|--|--|
| Turner..... | 16 | 18 |
| Union..... | 15 | 23 |
| Walworth.... | 16 | 45 |
| Yankton..... | 10 | 55 |
| Ziebach..... | 49 | 48 |
| Tennessee: | | |
| Anderson ... | 18 | 42 |
| Bedford | 14 | 35 |
| Benton..... | 17 | 31 |
| Bledsoe..... | 27 | 26 |
| Blount | 16 | 34 |
| Bradley | 16 | 21 |
| Campbell.... | 31 | 32 |
| Cannon..... | 23 | 11 |
| Carroll..... | 19 | 34 |
| Carter..... | 24 | 25 |
| Cheatham .. | 13 | 26 |
| Chester..... | 19 | 37 |
| Claiborne ... | 35 | 24 |
| Clay | 29 | 35 |
| Cocke..... | 33 | 31 |
| Coffee | 17 | 20 |
| Crockett | 25 | 41 |
| Cumber- land..... | 28 | 0 |
| Davidson.... | 17 | 59 |
| De Kalb..... | 25 | 19 |
| Decatur | 18 | 21 |
| Dickson | 12 | 32 |
| Dyer..... | 18 | 45 |
| Fayette..... | 38 | 50 |
| Fentress | 38 | 15 |
| Franklin | 20 | 2 |
| Gibson | 23 | 40 |
| Giles | 20 | 28 |
| Grainger | 25 | 25 |
| Greene..... | 20 | 22 |
| Grundy..... | 30 | 23 |
| Hamblen.... | 19 | 28 |
| Hamilton ... | 18 | 52 |
| Hancock..... | 49 | 36 |
| Harde- man..... | 33 | 57 |
| Hardin..... | 21 | 32 |
| Hawkins..... | 19 | 22 |
| Haywood.... | 43 | 42 |
| Hender- son..... | 20 | 25 |
| Henry..... | 17 | 30 |

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty
Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC |
|-----------------------|--|--|
| Hickman.... | 11 | 53 |
| Houston | 18 | 46 |
| Hum- phreys..... | 14 | 37 |
| Jackson..... | 26 | 19 |
| Jefferson | 20 | 27 |
| Johnson..... | 31 | 27 |
| Knox..... | 18 | 48 |
| Lake..... | 42 | 49 |
| Lauder- dale | 28 | 49 |
| Lawrence ... | 19 | 16 |
| Lewis | 20 | 19 |
| Lincoln..... | 20 | 25 |
| Loudon | 15 | 30 |
| Macon..... | 14 | 23 |
| Madison | 23 | 51 |
| Marion | 20 | 36 |
| Marshall | 11 | 43 |
| Maury | 18 | 34 |
| McMinn | 18 | 18 |
| McNairy..... | 20 | 28 |
| Meigs..... | 13 | 39 |
| Monroe..... | 24 | 26 |
| Montgom- ery..... | 15 | 32 |
| Moore | 20 | 7 |
| Morgan..... | 29 | 35 |
| Obion..... | 18 | 31 |
| Overton..... | 29 | 17 |
| Perry | 15 | 34 |
| Pickett..... | 36 | 21 |
| Polk | 22 | 22 |
| Putnam | 17 | 17 |
| Rhea | 23 | 33 |
| Roane | 15 | 42 |
| Robertson .. | 15 | 44 |
| Ruther- ford | 11 | 36 |
| Scott | 35 | 39 |
| Sequat- chie | 25 | 34 |
| Sevier | 17 | 24 |
| Shelby | 27 | 64 |
| Smith..... | 13 | 26 |
| Stewart | 18 | 29 |
| Sullivan | 15 | 30 |
| Sumner | 10 | 35 |
| Tipton..... | 24 | 51 |
| Trousdale... | 8 | 59 |

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty
Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC |
|---------------------|--|--|
| Unicoi..... | 18 | 32 |
| Union..... | 29 | 32 |
| Van Buren..... | 20 | 16 |
| Warren..... | 19 | 19 |
| Washington..... | 17 | 27 |
| Wayne..... | 18 | 22 |
| Weakley..... | 15 | 28 |
| White..... | 22 | 15 |
| Williamson..... | 9 | 55 |
| Wilson..... | 12 | 30 |
| Texas: | | |
| Anderson..... | 21 | 24 |
| Andrews..... | 15 | 5 |
| Angelina..... | 16 | 21 |
| Aransas..... | 21 | 16 |
| Archer..... | 8 | 7 |
| Armstrong..... | 8 | 0 |
| Atascosa..... | 29 | 27 |
| Austin..... | 17 | 24 |
| Bailey..... | 27 | 11 |
| Bandera..... | 12 | 16 |
| Bastrop..... | 21 | 24 |
| Baylor..... | 6 | 46 |
| Bee..... | 30 | 28 |
| Bell..... | 20 | 17 |
| Bexar..... | 25 | 35 |
| Blanco..... | 7 | 11 |
| Borden..... | 25 | 3 |
| Bosque..... | 17 | 14 |
| Bowie..... | 21 | 2 |
| Brazoria..... | 9 | 15 |
| Brazos..... | 15 | 27 |
| Brewster..... | 23 | 21 |
| Briscoe..... | 36 | 13 |
| Brooks..... | 34 | 35 |
| Brown..... | 14 | 14 |
| Burleson..... | 20 | 51 |
| Burnet..... | 22 | 17 |
| Caldwell..... | 26 | 26 |
| Calhoun..... | 18 | 33 |
| Callahan..... | 11 | 11 |
| Cameron..... | 41 | 23 |
| Camp..... | 18 | 35 |
| Carson..... | 10 | 3 |
| Cass..... | 20 | 34 |

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty
Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC |
|---------------------|--|--|
| Castro..... | 39 | 6 |
| Chambers..... | 17 | 25 |
| Cherokee..... | 20 | 23 |
| Childress..... | 16 | 19 |
| Clay..... | 12 | 11 |
| Cochran..... | 34 | 13 |
| Coke..... | 12 | 0 |
| Coleman..... | 21 | 31 |
| Collins..... | 7 | 19 |
| Comanche..... | 15 | 0 |
| Comstock..... | 27 | 8 |
| Cooke..... | 12 | 15 |
| Coryell..... | 16 | 8 |
| Cottle..... | 32 | 21 |
| Crane..... | 16 | 7 |
| Crockett..... | 11 | 16 |
| Crosby..... | 38 | 7 |
| Culberson..... | 19 | 10 |
| Dallam..... | 22 | 8 |
| Dallas..... | 14 | 33 |
| Dawson..... | 32 | 21 |
| De Witt..... | 29 | 28 |
| Deaf Smith..... | 25 | 21 |
| Delta..... | 25 | 45 |
| Denton..... | 6 | 18 |
| Dickens..... | 40 | 14 |
| Dimmit..... | 43 | 31 |
| Donley..... | 24 | 12 |
| Duval..... | 31 | 35 |
| Eastland..... | 17 | 14 |
| Ector..... | 14 | 14 |
| Edwards..... | 47 | 15 |
| El Paso..... | 29 | 16 |
| Ellis..... | 14 | 34 |
| Erath..... | 15 | 6 |
| Falls..... | 25 | 35 |
| Fannin..... | 15 | 40 |
| Fayette..... | 15 | 24 |
| Fisher..... | 18 | 29 |
| Floyd..... | 39 | 12 |
| Foard..... | 21 | 36 |
| Fort Bend..... | 10 | 24 |
| Franklin..... | 16 | 3 |
| Freestone..... | 15 | 32 |
| Frio..... | 40 | 31 |

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty
Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC |
|-----------------------|--|--|
| Gaines | 27 | 10 |
| Galveston... | 12 | 33 |
| Garza | 20 | 29 |
| Gillespie..... | 19 | 0 |
| Glasscock ... | 30 | 7 |
| Goliad | 21 | 28 |
| Gonzales..... | 30 | 28 |
| Gray | 10 | 16 |
| Grayson..... | 9 | 28 |
| Gregg | 15 | 35 |
| Grimes | 31 | 33 |
| Guada- lupe | 20 | 17 |
| Hale | 28 | 15 |
| Hall | 36 | 18 |
| Hamilton ... | 15 | 0 |
| Hansford | 12 | 8 |
| Harde- man | 26 | 22 |
| Hardin | 13 | 35 |
| Harris | 13 | 32 |
| Harrison ... | 21 | 53 |
| Hartley | 10 | 4 |
| Haskell | 27 | 25 |
| Hays | 17 | 26 |
| Hemphill ... | 8 | 4 |
| Hender- son | 14 | 31 |
| Hidalgo | 45 | 23 |
| Hill | 16 | 35 |
| Hockley | 26 | 14 |
| Hood | 10 | 11 |
| Hopkins | 15 | 24 |
| Houston | 28 | 41 |
| Howard | 21 | 25 |
| Hudspeth ... | 36 | 5 |
| Hunt | 18 | 27 |
| Hutchin- son | 7 | 15 |
| Irion | 9 | 27 |
| Jack | 10 | 5 |
| Jackson | 15 | 62 |
| Jasper | 18 | 38 |
| Jeff Davis... | 33 | 20 |
| Jefferson ... | 17 | 31 |
| Jim Hogg ... | 20 | 33 |
| Jim Wells .. | 25 | 37 |
| Johnson..... | 8 | 28 |
| Jones | 19 | 29 |
| Karnes | 31 | 30 |

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty
Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC |
|-----------------------|--|--|
| Kaufman.... | 18 | 30 |
| Kendall | 15 | 15 |
| Kenedy | 35 | 7 |
| Kent | 23 | 2 |
| Kerr | 18 | 25 |
| Kimble | 18 | 23 |
| King | 30 | 0 |
| Kinney | 45 | 18 |
| Kleberg | 27 | 34 |
| Knox | 30 | 30 |
| La Salle..... | 45 | 30 |
| Lamar | 24 | 40 |
| Lamb | 33 | 16 |
| Lampasas... | 21 | 13 |
| Lavaca | 14 | 25 |
| Lee | 15 | 25 |
| Leon | 26 | 31 |
| Liberty | 15 | 31 |
| Limestone.. | 26 | 4 |
| Lipscomb.... | 13 | 3 |
| Live Oak | 20 | 16 |
| Llano | 17 | 10 |
| Loving | 0 | n/a |
| Lubbock | 17 | 16 |
| Lynn | 37 | 12 |
| Madison | 25 | 30 |
| Marion | 36 | 32 |
| Martin | 22 | 18 |
| Mason | 29 | 4 |
| Mata- gorda | 15 | 28 |
| Maverick.... | 46 | 16 |
| McCul- loch | 25 | 22 |
| McLen- nan | 20 | 33 |
| McMullen .. | 12 | 39 |
| Medina | 28 | 20 |
| Menard | 35 | 7 |
| Midland | 11 | 3 |
| Milam | 22 | 32 |
| Mills | 27 | 6 |
| Mitchell | 29 | 13 |
| Montague... | 12 | 15 |
| Montgom- ery | 8 | 24 |
| Moore | 12 | 12 |
| Morris | 15 | 64 |
| Motley | 44 | 7 |

250

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty
Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC |
|----------------------------|--|--|
| Nacog- doches..... | 20 | 23 |
| Navarro..... | 22 | 27 |
| Newton..... | 24 | 30 |
| Nolan..... | 18 | 19 |
| Nueces..... | 22 | 35 |
| Ochiltree.... | 10 | 8 |
| Oldham..... | 6 | 9 |
| Orange..... | 12 | 26 |
| Palo Pinto.. | 12 | 21 |
| Panola..... | 15 | 34 |
| Parker..... | 10 | 13 |
| Parmer..... | 29 | 5 |
| Pecos..... | 22 | 11 |
| Polk..... | 23 | 31 |
| Potter..... | 16 | 16 |
| Presidio..... | 46 | 6 |
| Rains..... | 15 | 19 |
| Randall..... | 5 | 3 |
| Reagan..... | 23 | 4 |
| Real..... | 53 | 14 |
| Red River... | 33 | 29 |
| Reeves..... | 29 | 14 |
| Refugio..... | 24 | 34 |
| Roberts..... | 12 | 6 |
| Robertson.. | 32 | 0 |
| Rockwall.... | 8 | 24 |
| Runnels..... | 25 | 12 |
| Rusk..... | 16 | 38 |
| Sabine..... | 22 | 34 |
| San Augus- tine..... | 33 | 32 |
| San Jacinto.... | 27 | 37 |
| San Patricio .. | 22 | 30 |
| San Saba.... | 32 | 11 |
| Schleicher.. | 16 | 9 |
| Scurry..... | 15 | 23 |
| Shackel- ford..... | 12 | 24 |
| Shelby..... | 24 | 38 |
| Sherman.... | 10 | 9 |
| Smith..... | 16 | 30 |
| Somervell... | 9 | 18 |
| Starr..... | 58 | 14 |
| Stephens.... | 16 | 16 |
| Sterling..... | 17 | 0 |
| Stonewall... | 18 | 12 |

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty
Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC |
|-----------------------|--|--|
| Sutton..... | 17 | 5 |
| Swisher..... | 35 | 9 |
| Tarrant..... | 11 | 29 |
| Taylor..... | 13 | 2 |
| Terrell..... | 20 | 8 |
| Terry..... | 31 | 24 |
| Throck- morton.... | 25 | 0 |
| Titus..... | 13 | 19 |
| Tom Green..... | 13 | 29 |
| Travis..... | 15 | 27 |
| Trinity..... | 21 | 55 |
| Tyler..... | 16 | 29 |
| Upshur..... | 14 | 43 |
| Upton..... | 27 | 7 |
| Uvalde..... | 37 | 24 |
| Val Verde.. | 38 | 16 |
| Van Zandt..... | 13 | 24 |
| Victoria..... | 17 | 30 |
| Walker..... | 20 | 43 |
| Waller..... | 17 | 47 |
| Ward..... | 15 | 14 |
| Washing- ton..... | 18 | 48 |
| Webb..... | 40 | 19 |
| Wharton.... | 19 | 28 |
| Wheeler.... | 14 | 19 |
| Wichita..... | 15 | 22 |
| Wilbarger.. | 26 | 16 |
| Willacy..... | 42 | 24 |
| William- son..... | 10 | 27 |
| Wilson..... | 18 | 35 |
| Winkler..... | 11 | 13 |
| Wise..... | 15 | 11 |
| Wood..... | 15 | 21 |
| Yoakum.... | 21 | 10 |
| Young..... | 12 | 12 |
| Zapata..... | 35 | 25 |
| Zavala..... | 44 | 36 |
| Utah: | | |
| Beaver..... | 18 | 24 |
| Box Elder... | 9 | 34 |
| Cache..... | 11 | 19 |
| Carbon..... | 7 | 84 |
| Daggett..... | 14 | 25 |
| Davis..... | 6 | 37 |

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty
Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC |
|-----------------------|--|--|
| Duchesne ... | 13 | 26 |
| Emery..... | 8 | 30 |
| Garfield..... | 11 | 20 |
| Grand | 11 | 46 |
| Iron..... | 13 | 19 |
| Juab..... | 17 | 25 |
| Kane..... | 20 | 7 |
| Millard | 17 | 20 |
| Morgan..... | 7 | 14 |
| Piute..... | 9 | 55 |
| Rich | 16 | 5 |
| Salt Lake ... | 10 | 1 |
| San Juan ... | 36 | 65 |
| Sanpete | 17 | 25 |
| Sevier | 12 | 1 |
| Summit | 10 | 21 |
| Tooele..... | 10 | 42 |
| Uintah..... | 14 | 15 |
| Utah | 12 | 33 |
| Wasatch | 11 | 34 |
| Washing- ton..... | 18 | 17 |
| Wayne | 24 | 13 |
| Weber | 10 | 68 |
| Vermont: | | |
| Addison | 14 | 51 |
| Benning- ton..... | 10 | 91 |
| Caledonia... | 17 | 62 |
| Chitten- den | 9 | 98 |
| Essex | 19 | 2 |
| Franklin ... | 18 | 73 |
| Grand Isle.. | 14 | 46 |
| Lamoille..... | 15 | 80 |
| Orange | 16 | 46 |
| Orleans | 22 | 34 |
| Rutland..... | 14 | 61 |
| Washing- ton..... | 14 | 59 |
| Windham... | 15 | 61 |
| Windsor | 12 | 72 |
| Virginia: | | |
| Accomack .. | 28 | 51 |
| Albemarle.. | 10 | 48 |
| Alexan- dria | 15 | 98 |
| Alleghany.. | 10 | 25 |

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty
Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC |
|------------------------|--|--|
| Amelia | 10 | 61 |
| Amherst..... | 12 | 25 |
| Appomat- tox | 10 | 63 |
| Arlington... | 10 | 57 |
| Augusta | 12 | 25 |
| Bath | 15 | 8 |
| Bedford | 9 | 33 |
| Bedford City | 22 | n/a |
| Bland..... | 14 | 18 |
| Botetourt .. | 7 | 60 |
| Bristol | 21 | 31 |
| Bruns- wick | 29 | 33 |
| Buchanan .. | 22 | 27 |
| Bucking- ham..... | 23 | 43 |
| Buena Vista | 9 | 70 |
| Campbell.... | 11 | 43 |
| Caroline | 22 | 38 |
| Carroll..... | 16 | 21 |
| Charles City | 18 | 93 |
| Charlotte ... | 33 | 32 |
| Char- lottesville.. | 15 | 94 |
| Chesa- peake | 14 | 59 |
| Chester- field..... | 5 | 37 |
| Clarke..... | 10 | 37 |
| Clifton Forge | 24 | 15 |
| Colonial Heights... | 5 | 57 |
| Covington .. | 15 | 48 |
| Craig..... | 10 | 15 |
| Culpeper | 17 | 35 |
| Cumber- land..... | 27 | 41 |
| Danville | 19 | 55 |
| Dickenson.. | 20 | 29 |
| Dinwiddie .. | 15 | 55 |
| Emporia | 21 | 79 |
| Essex | 19 | 28 |
| Fairfax | 5 | 51 |
| Fairfax City | 6 | n/a |

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty
Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC |
|-------------------------|--|--|
| Falls | | |
| Church ... | 4 | 25 |
| Fauquier | 12 | 26 |
| Floyd | 12 | 24 |
| Fluvanna ... | 24 | 34 |
| Franklin | 29 | 39 |
| Franklin | 12 | 79 |
| Frederick ... | 11 | 19 |
| Freder- icksburg.. | 14 | 92 |
| Galax | 23 | 33 |
| Giles | 16 | 26 |
| Glouces- ter | 14 | 34 |
| Goochland.. | 16 | 46 |
| Grayson.... | 14 | 26 |
| Greene..... | 12 | 45 |
| Greens- ville | 28 | 52 |
| Halifax | 24 | 40 |
| Hampton.... | 17 | 70 |
| Hanover | 8 | 41 |
| Harrison- burg | 14 | 40 |
| Henrico | 7 | 31 |
| Henry | 12 | 23 |
| Highland.... | 15 | 14 |
| Hopewell.... | 16 | 55 |
| Isle Of Wight..... | 18 | 55 |
| James City | 13 | 51 |
| King And Queen | 22 | 48 |
| King George | 12 | 49 |
| King William .. | 16 | 47 |
| Lancaster... | 20 | 68 |
| Lee | 30 | 27 |
| Lexington .. | 21 | 36 |
| Loudoun.... | 7 | 36 |
| Louisa..... | 19 | 42 |
| Lunen- burg | 23 | 20 |
| Lynch- burg | 17 | 52 |
| Madison | 17 | 34 |
| Manassas... | 9 | 46 |

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty
Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC |
|-------------------------|--|--|
| Manassas Park | 8 | 95 |
| Martins- ville | 18 | 56 |
| Mathews | 11 | 60 |
| Mecklen- burg | 25 | 12 |
| Middlesex .. | 24 | 17 |
| Montgom- ery | 11 | 51 |
| Nelson | 22 | 40 |
| New Kent .. | 9 | 42 |
| Newport News | 19 | 73 |
| Norfolk..... | 30 | 77 |
| North- ampton ... | 32 | 65 |
| Norchem- berland ... | 14 | 65 |
| Norton..... | 25 | 29 |
| Nottoway ... | 24 | 42 |
| Orange | 18 | 36 |
| Page | 19 | 26 |
| Patrick | 12 | 21 |
| Peters- burg | 30 | 86 |
| Pittsylv- ania | 19 | 29 |
| Poquoson.... | 6 | n/a |
| Ports- mouth | 28 | 74 |
| Powhatan .. | 11 | 36 |
| Prince Edward... | 28 | 45 |
| Prince George | 10 | 28 |
| Prince William .. | 5 | 59 |
| Pulaski | 13 | 33 |
| Radford | 13 | 27 |
| Rappa- hannock.. | 14 | 36 |
| Richmond .. | 29 | 100 |
| Richmond County.... | 19 | 42 |
| Roanoke | 24 | 74 |
| Roanoke County.... | 7 | 44 |
| Rock- bridge | 16 | 25 |

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC |
|---------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Rocking-ham..... | 11 | 24 |
| Russell..... | 15 | 35 |
| Salem | 10 | n/a |
| Scott | 24 | 19 |
| Shenando-ah | 14 | 23 |
| Smyth..... | 17 | 27 |
| South Boston | 20 | n/a |
| South-ampton... | 28 | 49 |
| Spotsylva-nia | 12 | 36 |
| Stafford | 8 | 31 |
| Staunton.... | 11 | 43 |
| Suffolk..... | 23 | 64 |
| Surry | 29 | 49 |
| Sussex | 25 | 62 |
| Tazewell..... | 17 | 31 |
| Virginia Beach..... | 13 | 29 |
| Warren..... | 11 | 33 |
| Washing-ton..... | 17 | 21 |
| Waynes-boro..... | 13 | 50 |
| West-moreland.. | 26 | 50 |
| Williams-burg | 4 | 194 |
| Winches-ter | 21 | 41 |
| Wise..... | 19 | 26 |
| Wythe..... | 18 | 26 |
| York | 9 | 33 |
| Washington: | | |
| Adams..... | 15 | 55 |
| Asotin..... | 20 | 65 |
| Benton..... | 8 | 31 |
| Chelan..... | 14 | 67 |
| Clallam | 12 | 81 |
| Clark | 10 | 64 |
| Columbia ... | 12 | 75 |
| Cowlitz | 13 | 72 |
| Douglas | 12 | 41 |
| Ferry | 19 | 29 |
| Franklin | 18 | 43 |
| Garfield..... | 9 | 25 |

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC |
|-------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Grant..... | 17 | 45 |
| Grays Harbor.... | 12 | 81 |
| Island | 13 | 28 |
| Jefferson.... | 17 | 64 |
| King..... | 8 | 91 |
| Kitsap..... | 10 | 59 |
| Kittitas..... | 15 | 57 |
| Klickitat | 12 | 59 |
| Lewis | 13 | 61 |
| Lincoln..... | 10 | 41 |
| Mason..... | 12 | 77 |
| Okanogan .. | 19 | 51 |
| Pacific | 12 | 67 |
| Pend Oreille | 18 | 83 |
| Pierce | 13 | 86 |
| San Juan ... | 13 | 21 |
| Skagit | 13 | 73 |
| Skamania .. | 10 | 54 |
| Snohomish..... | 3 | 81 |
| Spokane | 13 | 67 |
| Stevens..... | 17 | 35 |
| Thurston.... | 11 | 65 |
| Wahkiah-kum..... | 13 | 56 |
| Walla Walla | 14 | 66 |
| Whatcom ... | 12 | 60 |
| Whitman.... | 10 | 25 |
| Yakima | 19 | 65 |
| West Virginia: | | |
| Barbour..... | 24 | 48 |
| Berkeley.... | 18 | 43 |
| Boone..... | 18 | 64 |
| Braxton..... | 27 | 46 |
| Brooke..... | 13 | 69 |
| Cabell | 16 | 66 |
| Calhoun | 34 | 38 |
| Clay | 37 | 35 |
| Doddridge .. | 27 | 33 |
| Fayette..... | 22 | 78 |
| Gilmer..... | 20 | 43 |
| Grant..... | 25 | 44 |
| Greenbrier..... | 16 | 31 |
| Hampshire..... | 19 | 66 |

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty
Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC |
|-----------------------|--|--|
| Hancock..... | 9 | 94 |
| Hardy | 22 | 42 |
| Harrison ... | 18 | 55 |
| Jackson | 13 | 32 |
| Jefferson ... | 17 | 60 |
| Kanawha ... | 13 | 53 |
| Lewis | 19 | 65 |
| Lincoln | 29 | 48 |
| Logan | 21 | 47 |
| Marion | 16 | 62 |
| Marshall ... | 12 | 72 |
| Mason | 15 | 34 |
| McDowell... | 31 | 78 |
| Mercer | 19 | 62 |
| Mineral | 16 | 68 |
| Mingo | 30 | 69 |
| Mononga- lia | 11 | 40 |
| Monroe | 25 | 15 |
| Morgan | 21 | 25 |
| Nicholas | 21 | 47 |
| Ohio | 14 | 82 |
| Pendleton .. | 26 | 39 |
| Pleasants ... | 15 | 37 |
| Pocahon- tas | 13 | 56 |
| Preston | 22 | 44 |
| Putnam | 11 | 42 |
| Raleigh | 16 | 66 |
| Randolph ... | 21 | 45 |
| Ritchie | 22 | 30 |
| Roane | 20 | 46 |
| Summers | 28 | 61 |
| Taylor | 19 | 59 |
| Tucker | 20 | 32 |
| Tyler | 17 | 35 |
| Upshur | 19 | 46 |
| Wayne | 23 | 35 |
| Webster | 36 | 52 |
| Wetzel | 13 | 55 |
| Wirt | 19 | 26 |
| Wood | 14 | 49 |
| Wyoming ... | 23 | 61 |
| Wisconsin: | | |
| Adams | 16 | 63 |
| Ashland | 14 | 76 |
| Barron | 14 | 71 |
| Bayfield | 16 | 68 |
| Brown | 8 | 101 |

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty
Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC |
|----------------------|--|--|
| Buffalo | 18 | 41 |
| Burnett | 18 | 100 |
| Calumet | 5 | 83 |
| Chippewa... | 12 | 83 |
| Clark | 21 | 30 |
| Columbia ... | 9 | 93 |
| Crawford.... | 18 | 45 |
| Dane | 7 | 106 |
| Dodge | 7 | 71 |
| Door | 8 | 50 |
| Douglas | 12 | 147 |
| Dunn | 13 | 75 |
| Eau Claire | 10 | 113 |
| Florence | 16 | 69 |
| Fond du Lac | 7 | 96 |
| Forest | 21 | 75 |
| Grant | 12 | 39 |
| Green | 11 | 64 |
| Green Lake | 9 | 71 |
| Iowa | 15 | 33 |
| Iron | 17 | 67 |
| Jackson | 16 | 72 |
| Jefferson ... | 7 | 66 |
| Juneau | 14 | 66 |
| Kenosha | 9 | 122 |
| Kewaunee... | 7 | 45 |
| La Crosse ... | 8 | 107 |
| Lafayette ... | 14 | 33 |
| Langlade ... | 17 | 77 |
| Lincoln | 11 | 57 |
| Man- itowoc | 6 | 97 |
| Marathon... | 9 | 68 |
| Marinette .. | 10 | 110 |
| Marquette.. | 13 | 68 |
| Menomi- nee | 22 | 187 |
| Milwau- kee | 16 | 131 |
| Monroe | 12 | 65 |
| Oconto | 13 | 55 |
| Oneida | 11 | 90 |
| Outaga- mie | 7 | 84 |
| Ozaukee | 4 | 74 |
| Pepin | 9 | 87 |
| Pierce | 10 | 54 |

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty
Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC |
|------------------------|--|--|
| Polk | 12 | 85 |
| Portage..... | 10 | 74 |
| Price | 15 | 46 |
| Racine | 10 | 139 |
| Richland | 14 | 74 |
| Rock..... | 9 | 124 |
| Rusk | 18 | 48 |
| Sauk | 11 | 88 |
| Sawyer | 20 | 83 |
| Shawano | 13 | 53 |
| Sheboy- gan | 6 | 89 |
| St. Croix..... | 7 | 74 |
| Taylor..... | 13 | 39 |
| Trempea- leau | 15 | 59 |
| Vernon | 16 | 37 |
| Vilas | 14 | 70 |
| Walworth... | 8 | 72 |
| Washburn.. | 13 | 88 |
| Washing- ton..... | 5 | 91 |
| Waukesha.. | 3 | 87 |
| Waupaca.... | 10 | 75 |
| Waushara.. | 13 | 67 |
| Winneba- go..... | 7 | 122 |
| Wood..... | 8 | 85 |

TABLE F-4—Cont.

1979 AFDC Participation and Poverty
Rates By State and County

| State and County | Percent of Children In Poverty | Percent of Children Receiving AFDC |
|-----------------------|--|--|
| Wyoming: | | |
| Albany | 10 | 34 |
| Big Horn.... | 15 | 20 |
| Campbell.... | 4 | 26 |
| Carbon..... | 6 | 44 |
| Converse | 5 | 41 |
| Crook | 13 | 23 |
| Fremont..... | 10 | 27 |
| Goshen | 12 | 45 |
| Hot Springs... | 7 | 33 |
| Johnson..... | 5 | 18 |
| Laramie | 9 | 63 |
| Lincoln..... | 14 | 12 |
| Natrona | 6 | 61 |
| Niobrara | 15 | 32 |
| Park..... | 8 | 38 |
| Platte..... | 9 | 24 |
| Sheridan | 4 | 55 |
| Sublette..... | 11 | 3 |
| Sweetwa- ter | 5 | 32 |
| Teton | 4 | 25 |
| Uinta | 3 | 69 |
| Washakie... | 7 | 42 |
| Weston | 10 | 24 |

TABLE F-5
1979 AFDC High Participation Counties

| | | |
|--------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| ALABAMA: | CALIFORNIA—Cont. | ILLINOIS—Cont. |
| Macon | Sutter | Franklin |
| Pickens | Tehama | Jackson |
| Sumter | Trinity | Jefferson |
| Wilcox | Tulare | Kane |
| ALASKA | Ventura | Kankakee |
| | Yolo | Lake |
| ARKANSAS: | Yuba | Macon |
| Dallas | COLORADO: | Madison |
| Phillips | Adams | Massac |
| CALIFORNIA: | Bent | Peoria |
| Alameda | Chaffee | Perry |
| Butte | Crowley | Pope |
| Calaveras | Denver | Pulaski |
| Contra Costa | Fremont | Rock Island |
| Del Norte | Lake | Sangamon |
| El Dorado | Las Animas | St. Clair |
| Fresno | Otero | Vermilion |
| Humboldt | Pueblo | White |
| Imperial | CONNECTICUT: | Will |
| Inyo | Fairfield | Winnebago |
| Kern | Hartford | INDIANA: |
| Kings | Litchfield | Allen |
| Lake | Middlesex | Clark |
| Lassen | New Haven | Floyd |
| Los Angeles | New London | Lake |
| Madera | Tolland | Marion |
| Marin | Windham | St. Joseph |
| Mendocino | DELAWARE: | Vanderburgh |
| Merced | Kent | Wayne |
| Modoc | DISTRICT OF | IOWA: |
| Monterey | COLUMBIA: | Appanoose |
| Napa | Washington | Black Hawk |
| Nevada | GEORGIA: | Boone |
| Orange | Fulton | Cerro Gordo |
| Placer | Twiggs | Clinton |
| Plumas | Upton | Dallas |
| Riverside | Wilkinson | Des Moines |
| Sacramento | HAWAII: | Dubuque |
| San Bernardino | Hawaii | Floyd |
| San Diego | Honolulu | Henry |
| San Francisco | Kauai | Jasper |
| San Joaquin | Maui | Jefferson |
| San Luis Obispo | IDAHO: | Lee |
| San Mateo | Shoshone | Linn |
| Santa Barbara | ILLINOIS: | Marshall |
| Santa Clara | Alexander | Montgomery |
| Santa Cruz | Champaign | Muscatine |
| Shasta | Cook | Page |
| Sierra | | Polk |
| Siskiyou | | Pottawattamie |
| Solano | | Scott |
| Sonoma | | Wapello |
| Stanislaus | | Warren |

(253)

257

TABLE F-5—*Cont.*
1979 AFDC High Participation Counties

| | | |
|----------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| IOWA—Cont. | MARYLAND: | MICHIGAN—Cont. |
| Webster | Anne Arundel | Gogebic |
| Woodbury | Baltimore City | Grand Traverse |
| KANSAS: | Calvert | Gratiot |
| Butler | Caroline | Hillsdale |
| Cowley | Cecil | Houghton |
| Crawford | Charles | Ingham |
| Doniphan | Dorchester | Ionia |
| Ford | Harford | Iosco |
| Harvey | Montgomery | Iron |
| Johnson | Prince George's | Isabella |
| Labette | Queen Anne's | Jackson |
| Leavenworth | Wicomico | Kalamazoo |
| Miami | MASSACHUSETTS: | Kalkaska |
| Montgomery | Barnstable | Kent |
| Saline | Berkshire | Keweenaw |
| Sedgwick | Bristol | Lake |
| Shawnee | Dukes | Lapeer |
| Sherman | Essex | Leelanau |
| Wyandotte | Franklin | Lenawee |
| KENTUCKY: | Hampden | Livingston |
| Campbell | Hampshire | Luce |
| Fayette | Middlesex | Mackinac |
| Fulton | Nantucket | Macomb |
| Franklin | Norfolk | Manistee |
| Henderson | Plymouth | Marquette |
| Hickman | Suffolk | Mason |
| Jefferson | Worcester | Mecosta |
| Kenton | MICHIGAN: | Menominee |
| Logan | Alger | Midland |
| McCracken | Allegan | Missaukee |
| Simpson | Alpena | Monroe |
| LOUISIANA: | Antrim | Montcalm |
| East Carroll | Arenac | Montmorency |
| Jackson | Baraga | Muskegon |
| Orleans | Barry | Newaygo |
| St. John The Baptist | Bay | Oakland |
| MAINE: | Benzie | Oceana |
| Androscoggin | Berrien | Ogemaw |
| Aroostook | Branch | Ontonagon |
| Cumberland | Calhoun | Osceola |
| Franklin | Cass | Oscoda |
| Hancock | Charlevoix | Ottawa |
| Kennebec | Cheboygan | Roscommon |
| Knox | Chippewa | Saginaw |
| Oxford | Clare | Sanilac |
| Penobscot | Clinton | Schoolcraft |
| Piscataquis | Crawford | Shiawassee |
| Sagadahoc | Delta | St. Clair |
| Somerset | Dickinson | St. Joseph |
| York | Eaton | Tuscola |
| | Emmet | Van Buren |
| | Genesee | Washtenaw |
| | Gladwin | Wayne |
| | | Wexford |

TABLE F-5—*Cont.*
1979 AFDC High Participation Counties

| | | |
|---------------------|------------------------|----------------------|
| MINNESOTA: | NEW HAMPSHIRE: | NORTH DAKOTA: |
| Anoka | Hillsborough | Benson |
| Beltrami | Rockingham | Rolette |
| Blue Earth | Strafford | |
| Carlton | | OHIO: |
| Chisago | NEW JERSEY: | Allen |
| Clay | Atlantic | Ashtabula |
| Dakota | Burlington | Athens |
| Hennepin | Camden | Belmont |
| Itasca | Cape May | Butler |
| Koochiching | Cumberland | Clark |
| Lake | Essex | Cuyahoga |
| Mille Lacs | Gloucester | Erie |
| Olmsted | Hudson | Franklin |
| Ramsey | Hunterdon | Greene |
| Scott | Mercer | Hamilton |
| Sherburne | Middlesex | Hocking |
| St. Louis | Monmouth | Jackson |
| Washington | Ocean | Jefferson |
| Winona | Passaic | Lawrence |
| Wright | Salem | Licking |
| | Somerset | Lorain |
| MISSISSIPPI: | Sussex | Lucas |
| Hinds | Union | Mahoning |
| Holmes | Warren | Marion |
| Jefferson | | Montgomery |
| Madison | NEW YORK: | Ottawa |
| Montgomery | Albany | Perry |
| Sharkey | Broome | Portage |
| Tate | Chautauqua | Richland |
| Walthall | Chemung | Ross |
| Warren | Cortland | Scioto |
| | Erie | Stark |
| MISSOURI: | Monroe | Summit |
| Boone | Nassau | Trumbull |
| Dunklin | New York | Tuscarawas |
| Howard | Niagara | Warren |
| Jackson | Oneida | |
| Mississippi | Onondaga | OKLAHOMA: |
| New Madrid | Orange | Oklahoma |
| Pemiscot | Orleans | |
| Scott | Putnam | OREGON: |
| St. Louis | Rockland | Baker |
| St. Louis City | Schenectady | Benton |
| | Suffolk | Clackamas |
| MONTANA: | Ulster | Clatsop |
| Silver Bow | Westchester | Columbia |
| | | Coos |
| NEBRASKA: | NORTH CAROLINA: | Crook |
| Douglas | Durham | Curry |
| Hall | Forsyth | Deschutes |
| Lancaster | Guilford | Douglas |
| Thurston | Jones | Gilliam |
| | Mecklenburg | Grant |
| NEVADA: | Scotland | Harney |
| Esmeralda | Wake | Jackson |

TABLE F-5—Cont.
1979 AFDC High Participation Counties

| | | |
|---------------|-----------------|----------------|
| OREGON—Cont. | SOUTH CAROLINA: | VIRGINIA—Cont. |
| Josephine | Abbeville | Suffolk |
| Klamath | Allendale | Williamsburg |
| Lane | Bamberg | |
| Lincoln | Barnwell | WASHINGTON: |
| Linn | Beaufort | Asotin |
| Marion | Calhoun | Chelan |
| Multnomah | Hampton | Clallam |
| Polk | Jasper | Clerk |
| Tillamook | McCormick | Columbia |
| Umatilla | Newberry | Cowlitz |
| Union | Orangeburg | Grays Harbor |
| Wasco | | Jefferson |
| Washington | SOUTH DAKOTA: | King |
| Yamhill | Hughes | Mason |
| | Pennington | Pacific |
| PENNSYLVANIA: | Shannon | Pend Oreille |
| Allegheny | Todd | Pierce |
| Armstrong | TENNESSEE: | Skagit |
| Beaver | Shelby | Snohomish |
| Berks | | Spokane |
| Blair | TEXAS: | Thurston |
| Bradford | Morris | Walla Walla |
| Bucks | | Yakima |
| Butler | UTAH: | |
| Chester | Carbon | WEST VIRGINIA: |
| Clinton | San Juan | Boone |
| Dauphin | Weber | Brooke |
| Delaware | | Cabell |
| Elk | VERMONT: | Fayette |
| Erie | Bennington | Hampshire |
| Fayette | Chittenden | Hancock |
| Greene | Franklin | Lewis |
| Lackawanna | Lamoille | Marshall |
| Lawrence | Windsor | McDowell |
| Lehigh | | Mineral |
| Luzerne | VIRGINIA: | Mingo |
| Lycoming | Alexandria | Ohio |
| McKean | Buena Vista | Raleigh |
| Mercer | Charles City | |
| Monroe | Charlottesville | WISCONSIN: |
| Montgomery | Emporia | Adams |
| Northampton | Franklin | Ashland |
| Philadelphia | Fredericksburg | Barron |
| Venango | Hampton | Bayfield |
| Washington | Lancaster | Brown |
| Westmoreland | Manassas Park | Burnett |
| Wyoming | Newport News | Calumet |
| York | Norfolk | Chippewa |
| | Northampton | Columbia |
| RHODE ISLAND: | Northumberland | Dane |
| Bristol | Petersburg | Dodge |
| Kent | Portsmouth | Douglas |
| Newport | Richmond City | Dunn |
| Providence | Roanoke | Eau Claire |
| Washington | | Florence |

TABLE F-5—*Cont.*
1979 AFDC High Participation Counties

| WISCONSIN—Cont. | WISCONSIN—Cont. | WISCONSIN—Cont. |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Fond du Lac | Marquette | Sawyer |
| Forest | Menominee | Sheboygan |
| Green | Milwaukee | St. Croix |
| Green Lake | Monroe | Vilas |
| Iron | Oneida | Walworth |
| Jackson | Outagamie | Washburn |
| Jefferson | Ozaukee | Washington |
| Juneau | Pepin | Waukesha |
| Kenosha | Polk | Waupaca |
| La Crosse | Portage | Waushara |
| Langlade | Racine | Winnebago |
| Manitowoc | Richland | Wood |
| Marathon | Rock | |
| Marinette | Sauk | WYOMING: |
| | | Uinta |

TABLE F-6
1979 AFDC Low Participation Counties

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| ALABAMA: Blount Cherokee Cullman Dale De Kalb Winston | FLORIDA—Cont. Gilchrist Hardee Lafayette Suwannee | ILLINOIS—Cont. Edgar Jo Daviess Kendall Marshall Moultrie Putnam Schuyler Scott Stark |
| ARIZONA: Cochise Mohave Navajo Santa Cruz Yavapai Yuma | GEORGIA: Banks Brantley Chattahoochee Cherokee Dawson Fannin Fayette Forsyth Gilmer Gwinnett Habersham Murray Pickens Rabun Towns Union White | INDIANA: Adams Blackford Clay Daviess Decatur Fayette Fountain Franklin Fulton Greene Harrison Huntington Jasper Kosciusko Lagrange Newton Noble Orange Owen Pulaski Putnam Ripley Rush Spencer Steuben Warren Washington Whitley |
| ARKANSAS: Baxter Boone Carroll Cleburne Crawford Faulkner Franklin Fulton Grant Izard Logan Madison Marion Montgomery Newton Randolph Searcy Sevier | IDAHO: Adams Bear Lake Bingham Blaine Boundary Butte Caribou Cassia Clark Custer Elmore Franklin Fremont Gooding Jefferson Jerome Lincoln Madison Minidoka Oneida Owyhee Teton Twin Falls | IOWA: Adair Davis Howard Ida Lyon Plymouth Shelby Sioux Winneshiek |
| COLORADO: Baca Cheyenne Douglas Eagle Gilpin Gunnison Hinsdale Kit Carson Park Phillips Pitkin San Miguel Summit Teller Washington Yuma | ILLINOIS: Brown Bureau Calhoun Clinton Cumberland | KANSAS: Anderson Barber Cheyenne |
| FLORIDA: Clay Collier | | |

(258)

TABLE F-6—Cont.
1979 AFDC Low Participation Counties

| KANSAS—Cont. | MINNESOTA—Cont. | MONTANA—Cont. |
|---------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Decatur | Traverse | Toole |
| Gove | Yellow Medicine | Treasure |
| Graham | | Wheatland |
| Haskell | MISSISSIPPI: | Wibaux |
| Harper | Itawamba | |
| Hodgeman | Rankin | NEBRASKA: |
| Jewell | Tishomingo | Antelope |
| Kearny | | Arthur |
| Kiowa | MISSOURI: | Banner |
| Lincoln | Atchison | Blaine |
| Logan | Barton | Boone |
| Marion | Daviess | Boyd |
| Nemaha | De Kalb | Brown |
| Ness | Douglas | Burt |
| Norton | Gasconade | Butler |
| Rawlins | Gentry | Cedar |
| Rooks | Grundy | Chase |
| Scott | Knox | Cherry |
| Sheridan | Macon | Cheyenne |
| Smith | Mercer | Colfax |
| Stafford | Moniteau | Cuming |
| Stanton | Monroe | Custer |
| Wallace | Morgan | Dixon |
| Washington | Nodaway | Dundy |
| Woodson | Oregon | Fillmore |
| | Osage | Franklin |
| KENTUCKY: | Putnam | Frontier |
| Green | Schuyler | Furnas |
| Metcalf | Scotland | Garden |
| Robertson | Shelby | Gosper |
| | Stone | Grant |
| LOUISIANA: | Webster | Greeley |
| Cameron | | Hamilton |
| Livingston | MONTANA: | Harlan |
| Vernon | Broadwater | Hayes |
| | Carter | Hitchcock |
| MINNESOTA: | Chouteau | Holt |
| Fillmore | Daniels | Hooker |
| Grant | Fallon | Jefferson |
| Jackson | Fergus | Johnson |
| Lac qui Parle | Gallatin | Kearney |
| Lincoln | Garfield | Keya Paha |
| Marshall | Golden Valley | Knox |
| Norman | Judith Basin | Logan |
| Otter Tail | Liberty | McPherson |
| Pipestone | Madison | Morrill |
| Pope | McCone | Nance |
| Red Lake | Meagher | Pawnee |
| Redwood | Petroleum | Perkins |
| Renville | Phillips | Pierce |
| Rock | Powder River | Platte |
| Roseau | Prairie | Polk |
| Sibley | Sheridan | Red Willow |
| Stevens | Stillwater | Rock |
| Todd | Sweet Grass | |

TABLE F-6—*Cont.*
1979 AFDC Low Participation Counties

| | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|------------------------|
| NEBRASKA—Cont. | NORTH DAKOTA: | SOUTH DAKOTA— Cont. |
| Saline | Adams | Brule |
| Saunders | Billings | Campbell |
| Sherman | Bowman | Clark |
| Sioux | Burke | Custer |
| Stanton | Dickey | Day |
| Thayer | Dunn | Deuel |
| Thomas | Emmons | Douglas |
| Valley | Golden Valley | Edmunds |
| Wayne | Grant | Faulk |
| Wheeler | Hettinger | Giant |
| | Kidder | Haakon |
| NEVADA: | La Moure | Hamlin |
| Carson City | Logan | Hand |
| Churchill | McHenry | Hanson |
| Douglas | McIntosh | Harding |
| Elko | Mercer | Hutchinson |
| Eureka | Nelson | Hyde |
| Humboldt | Oliver | Jerauld |
| Lander | Pierce | Kingsbury |
| Lyon | Renville | Marshall |
| Nye | Sheridan | McCook |
| Pershing | Slope | McPherson |
| Washoe | Stark | Miner |
| | Steele | Moody |
| NEW MEXICO: | Wells | Perkins |
| Catron | | Potter |
| Harding | OHIO: | Sanborn |
| Los Alamos | Holmes | Spink |
| | | Sully |
| NEW YORK: | OKLAHOMA: | Turner |
| Chenango | Alfalfa | Union |
| | Beaver | |
| NORTH CAROLINA: | Cimarron | |
| Ashe | Ellis | TENNESSEE: |
| Avery | Grant | Bradley |
| Caldwell | Harper | Cannon |
| Cherokee | Jefferson | Coffee |
| Clay | Kingfisher | Cumberland |
| Currituck | Major | De Kalb |
| Graham | Payne | Decatur |
| Haywood | Texas | Fentress |
| Hyde | Washington | Greene |
| Jackson | Woodward | Grundy |
| Macon | | Hawkins |
| Martin | OREGON: | Jackson |
| Onslow | Sherman | Lawrence |
| Polk | Wheeler | Lewis |
| Randolph | | Macon |
| Surry | SOUTH CAROLINA: | McMinn |
| Watauga | Marlboro | Moore |
| Wilkes | Oconee | Overton |
| Yadkin | | Pickett |
| Yancey | SOUTH DAKOTA: | Polk |
| | Aurora | Putnam |
| | Bon Homme | |
| | Brookings | |

TABLE F-6—*Cont.*
1979 AFDC Low Participation Counties

| TENNESSEE—Cont. | TEXAS—Cont. | TEXAS—Cont. |
|-----------------|-------------|--------------|
| Sevier | El Paso | Parmer |
| Van Buren | Erath | Pecos |
| Warren | Floyd | Potter |
| Wayne | Franklin | Presidio |
| White | Gaines | Rains |
| TEXAS: | Gillespie | Randall |
| Andrews | Glasscock | Reagan |
| Angelina | Gray | Real |
| Arañas | Guadalupe | Reeves |
| Archer | Hale | Roberts |
| Armstrong | Hall | Rockwell |
| Bailey | Hamilton | Runnels |
| Bandera | Hansford | San Saba |
| Bastrop | Hardeman | Schleicher |
| Bell | Hartley | Scurry |
| Blanco | Hemphill | Sherman |
| Borden | Hidalgo | Somervell |
| Bosque | Hockley | Starr |
| Brazoria | Hood | Stephens |
| Brewster | Hudspeth | Sterling |
| Briscoe | Hutchinson | Stonewall |
| Brown | Jack | Sutton |
| Burnet | Jeff Davis | Swisher |
| Callahan | Kendall | Taylor |
| Cameron | Kenedy | Terrell |
| Carson | Kent | Throckmorton |
| Castro | Kimble | Titus |
| Cherokee | King | Upton |
| Childress | Kinney | Uvalde |
| Clay | Lamb | Val Verde |
| Cochran | Lampasas | Ward |
| Coke | Lipscomb | Webb |
| Collin | Live Oak | Wheeler |
| Collingsworth | Llano | Wichita |
| Comal | Lubbock | Wilbarger |
| Comanche | Lynn | Willacy |
| Concho | Martin | Winkler |
| Cooke | Mason | Wise |
| Coryell | Maverick | Wood |
| Cottle | McCulloch | Yoakum |
| Crane | Medina | Young |
| Crockett | Menard | UTAH: |
| Crosby | Midland | Cache |
| Culterson | Mills | Garfield |
| Dallam | Mitchell | Iron |
| Dawson | Montague | Kane |
| Deaf Smith | Moore | Millard |
| Denton | Motley | Morgan |
| Dickens | Nacogdoches | Rich |
| Donley | Nolan | Summit |
| Eastland | Ochiltree | Uintah |
| Ector | Oldham | Washington |
| Edwards | Palo Pinto | Wayne |
| | Parker | |

TABLE F-6—*Cont.*
1979 AFDC Low Participation Counties

VIRGINIA:

Bath
 Bland
 Carroll
 Clifton Forge
 Craig
 Frederick
 Henry
 Highland
 Lunenburg
 Mecklenburg

VIRGINIA—Cont.

Middlesex
 Patrick
 Rockingham
 Scott
 Shenandoah
 Washington

WASHINGTON:

San Juan

WEST VIRGINIA:

Monroe

WYOMING:

Big Horn
 Crook
 Johnson
 Lincoln
 Platte
 Sublette
 Weston

TABLE F-7
Child Poverty Counties With High Participation In AFDC: 1984

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA: Washington | MISSISSIPPI: Claiborne | OHIO: Adams Pike |
| GEORGIA: Fulton | MISSOURI: Dunklin Mississippi Pemiscot St. Louis City | PENNSYLVANIA: Philadelphia |
| ILLINOIS: Alexander Pulaski St. Clair | NEBRASKA: Thurston | SOUTH CAROLINA: Allendale |
| MARYLAND: Baltimore City | NEW JERSEY: Essex Hudson | VIRGINIA: Petersburg Richmond City |
| MASSACHUSETTS: Suffolk | NEW YORK: New York | WEST VIRGINIA: Lincoln McDowell Mingo |
| MICHIGAN: Lake | NORTH DAKOTA: Rolette | |

TABLE F-8
Child Poverty Counties With Low Participation In AFDC: 1984

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| ALABAMA: Bibb Lawrence | NEW MEXICO: Union | TENNESSEE—Cont. Cumberland Fentress Jackson Overton Pickett |
| ARKANSAS: Fulton Marion Newton Polk Scott Searcy Sharp Stone | NORTH CAROLINA: Cherokee Chowan Madison Yancey | TEXAS: Atascosa Bailey Briscoe Castro Cochran Collingsworth Concho Cottle Crosby Dawson Dickens Edwards El Paso Floyd Gaines Glasscock Hale Hall Hardeman Haskell Hockley Hudspeth Jeff Davis Kenedy King Kinney Knox Lamb Leon Limestone Lynn Mason Maverick McColloch Medina Menard Mills Mitchell Motley Parmer Presidio Real Reeves Runnels San Saba Starr Swisher |
| COLORADO: Baca | NORTH DAKOTA: Billings Dunn Emmons Grant Hettinger Kidder Logan McIntosh Sheridan Slope | |
| GEORGIA: Towns Union | OKLAHOMA: Marshall | |
| IDAHO: Owyhee Washington | SOUTH CAROLINA: Saluda | |
| KENTUCKY: Casey Clinton | SOUTH DAKOTA: Aurora Bon Homme Brule Campbell Charles Mix Clark Deuel Douglas Edmunds Faulk Hamlin Hand Hanson Harding Hutchinson Hyde Jackson Kingsbury Lyman Marshall McPherson Miner Potter Sanborn Sully | |
| MISSISSIPPI: Attala Smith | | |
| MISSOURI: Knox | | |
| MONTANA: Carter Garfield Judith Basin Petroleum Prairie Treasure | | |
| NEBRASKA: Arthur Banner Blaine Boyd Greeley Hayes Logan Wheeler | | |
| NEVADA: Eureka | TENNESSEE: Bledsoe Claiborne | |

(264)

TABLE F-8—*Cont.*

Child Poverty Counties With Low Participation In AFDC: 1984

TEXAS—Cont.

Terry
Upton
Uvalde

TEXAS—Cont.

Val Verde
Webb
Wilbarger

WEST VIRGINIA:

Pendleton

TABLE F-9
Child Poverty Counties With High Participation in AFDC: 1979

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| ALABAMA: Macon Pickens Sumter Wilcox | MASSACHUSETTS: Suffolk | PENNSYLVANIA: Philadelphia |
| ARKANSAS: Phillips | MICHIGAN: Lake | SOUTH CAROLINA: Allendale Bamberg Calhoun Hampton Jasper McCormick Orangeburg |
| COLORADO: Las Animas Otero | MISSISSIPPI: Hinds Holmes Jefferson Madison Montgomery Sharkey Tate Walthall | SOUTH DAKOTA: Shannon Todd |
| DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA: Washington | MISSOURI: Dunklin Mississippi New Madrid Pemiscot St. Louis City | TENNESSEE: Shelby |
| GEORGIA: Fulton | NEBRASKA: Thurston | UTAH: San Juan |
| ILLINOIS: Alexander Pulaski St. Clair | NEW JERSEY: Essex Hudson | VIRGINIA: Franklin Norfolk Northampton Petersburg Portsmouth Richmond City |
| KENTUCKY: Fulton | NEW YORK: New York | WEST VIRGINIA: McDowell Mingo |
| LOUISIANA: East Carroll Orleans | NORTH DAKOTA: Benson Rolette | |
| MARYLAND: Baltimore City | | |

TABLE F-10
Child Poverty Counties With Low Participation in AFDC: 1979

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| ARIZONA: Navajo | NEVADA: Eureka | TEXAS: Bailey |
| ARKANSAS: Fulton Marion Newton Searcy | NORTH CAROLINA: Cherokee Hyde Martin Yancey | Briscoe Cameron Castro Cochran Collingsworth Concho Cottle Crosby Dawson Dickens Edwards El Paso Floyd Gaines Glasscock Hale Hall Hardeman Hidalgo Hockley Hudspeth Jeff Davis Kenedy Kinney Kinney Lamb Lynn Mason Maverick McCulloch Medina Menard Mills Mitchell Motley Parmer Presidio Real Reeves Runnels San Saba Starr Swisher Upton Uvalde Val Verde Webb Wilbarger Willacy |
| COLORADO: Baca | NORTH DAKOTA: Billings Dunn Emmons Grant Hettinger Kidder Logan McIntosh Sheridan Slope | |
| FLORIDA: Hardēe Suwannee | SOUTH CAROLINA: Marlboro | |
| GEORGIA: Townes Union | SOUTH DAKOTA: Aurora Bon Homme Brule Campbell Clark Deuel Douglas Edmunds Faulk Hamlin Hand Hanson Harding Hutchinson Hyde Kingsbury Marshall McPherson Miner Potter Sanborn Sully | |
| IDAHO: Owyhee | | |
| IOWA: Davis | | |
| KENTUCKY: Green Metcalf Robertson | | |
| MINNESOTA: Lincoln | | |
| MISSOURI: Douglas Knox Oregon Stone | | |
| MONTANA: Carter Garfield Judith Basin Petroleum Prairie Treasure | | |
| NEBRASKA: Arthur Banner Blaine Boyd Greeley Hayes Logan Morrill Wheeler | TENNESSEE: Cumberland Fentress Grundy Jackson Overton Pickett | |

APPENDIX G
Tables Relating to Participation in Head Start

| | Page |
|---|------|
| Table G-1—Head Start High Participation Counties | 271 |
| Table G-2—Head Start Low Participation Counties..... | 276 |
| Table G-3—Child Poverty Counties With High Participation In Head Start | 282 |
| Table G-4—Child Poverty Counties With Low Participation In Head Start | 284 |

TABLE G-1
Head Start High Participation Counties

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| ALABAMA: Chambers Colbert Cullman Greene Jackson Lee Lowndes Macon Montgomery Pickens Sumter Tallapoosa | COLORADO—Cont. Conejos Costilla Crowley Fremont Huerfano Jefferson La Plata Las Animas Montezuma Otero Rio Grande Saguache | GEORGIA—Cont. Whitfield Worth |
| ARIZONA: Apache Coconino Gila Navajo Pinal Santa Cruz | FLORIDA: Charlotte De Soto Indian River Manatee Okeechobee Taylor | IDAHO: Canyon Clearwater Nez Perce Washington |
| ARKANSAS: Baxter Carroll Clark Clay Cleveland Conway Fulton Hot Spring Izard Johnson Lawrence Little River Madison Perry Pope Randolph Saline Scott Searcy Yell | GEORGIA: Banks Butts Chattooga Clinch Colquitt Dade Dawson Fannin Franklin Gilmer Habersham Hall Hart Jackson Jasper Jeff Davis Lumpkin Morgan Oglethorpe Pickens Pulaski Putnam Rabun Rockdale Schley Stephens Stewart Townsend Walker Washington Webster White | ILLINOIS: Alexander Cass Coles Edwards Hamilton Massac Monroe Moultrie Perry Pulaski Richland Wabash |
| CALIFORNIA: Alpine Imperial Lake Madera Mono Napa San Luis Obispo | | INDIANA: Dearborn Floyd Fountain Jefferson Knox Ohio Ripley St. Joseph Sullivan Switzerland |
| COLORADO: Alamosa Archuleta Bent | | IOWA: Boone Clay Decatur Harrison Lucas Monona Pocahontas |
| | | KANSAS: Allen Brown Cherokee Crawford Doniphan Grant Jackson Labette Neosho Shawnee |

(271)

TABLE G-1—*Cont.*
Head Start High Participation Counties

| | | |
|--------------|-------------------|-----------------|
| KENTUCKY: | MARYLAND: | MINNESOTA—Cont. |
| Ballard | Calvert | Wright |
| Bath | Charles | Yellow Medicine |
| Boyd | Howard | |
| Bracken | Kent | MISSISSIPPI: |
| Breckinridge | Montgomery | Adams |
| Calloway | Queen Anne's | Alcorn |
| Carlisle | Somerset | Amite |
| Carroll | Talbot | Attala |
| Cumberland | Worcester | Benton |
| Elliott | | Bolivar |
| Fleming | MICHIGAN: | Calhoun |
| Grant | Alger | Carroll |
| Hickman | Alpena | Chickasaw |
| Jackson | Baraga | Choctaw |
| Johnson | Benzie | Claiborne |
| Knott | Chippewa | Clarke |
| Knox | Crawford | Clay |
| Lee | Dickinson | Coahoma |
| Lyon | Gladwin | Copiah |
| Magoffin | Gogebic | De Soto |
| Martin | Houghton | Forrest |
| Mason | Huron | Franklin |
| McCracken | Iron | George |
| Menifee | Jackson | Greene |
| Morgan | Keweenaw | Grenada |
| Nicholas | Lake | Hancock |
| Oldham | Leelanau | Harrison |
| Owsley | Luce | Holmes |
| Pike | Mackinac | Humphreys |
| Powell | Menominee | Issaquena |
| Robertson | Montmorency | Itawamba |
| Taylor | Newaygo | Jackson |
| Trigg | Ontonagon | Jasper |
| Trimble | Osceola | Jefferson |
| Washington | Oscoda | Jefferson Davis |
| Wolfe | Presque Isle | Jones |
| | Roscommon | Kemper |
| | Schoolcraft | Lafayette |
| LOUISIANA: | MINNESOTA: | Lauderdale |
| Acadia | Beltrami | Lawrence |
| Catahoula | Big Stone | Leake |
| Iberville | Cass | Lee |
| La Saile | Cook | Leflore |
| Lafayette | Grant | Lincoln |
| Rapides | Itasca | Lowndes |
| St. Helena | Koochiching | Madison |
| St. James | Lac qui Parle | Marion |
| St. Landry | Lake | Marshall |
| St. Martin | Lake Of The Woods | Montgomery |
| Vermilion | Mille Lacs | Neshoba |
| MAINE: | Polk | Newton |
| Franklin | Roseau | Noxubee |
| Piscataquis | St. Louis | Pearl River |
| | Traverse | Perry |

TABLE G-1—Cont.
Head Start High Participation Counties

| | | |
|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| MISSISSIPPI—Cont. | MONTANA: | NORTH CAROLINA: |
| Pike | Blaine | Chatham |
| Pontotoc | Deer Lodge | Dare |
| Prentiss | Glacier | Franklin |
| Quitman | Hill | Haywood |
| Rankin | Lewis And Clark | Henderson |
| Scott | Missoula | Jackson |
| Sharkey | Pondera | Jones |
| Smith | Roosevelt | Macon |
| Stone | Rosebud | Madison |
| Sunflower | Silver Bow | Martin |
| Tate | | Pamlico |
| Tippah | NEBRASKA: | Rowan |
| Tishomingo | Adams | Scotland |
| Tunica | Box Butte | Swain |
| Walthall | Cass | Vance |
| Warren | Dakota | Wayne |
| Washington | Dawes | Yadkin |
| Wayne | Fillmore | |
| Webster | Greeley | NORTH DAKOTA: |
| Wilkinson | Hall | McHenry |
| Winston | Nemaha | Rolette |
| Yalobusha | Richardson | Sioux |
| Yazoo | Sheridan | Williams |
| | Thurston | |
| MISSOURI: | NEVADA: | OHIO: |
| Barry | Douglas | Delaware |
| Bollinger | Elko | Gallia |
| Caldwell | Humboldt | Guernsey |
| Carter | Mineral | Highland |
| Chariton | White Pine | Jackson |
| Clark | | Lucas |
| Dade | NEW MEXICO: | Mercer |
| Douglas | Catron | Monroe |
| Dunklin | Eddy | Morrow |
| Gentry | Grant | Noble |
| Holt | Guadalupe | Ottawa |
| Howard | McKinley | Pike |
| Lewis | Mora | Preble |
| Madison | Quay | Putnam |
| Mississippi | Rio Arriba | Scioto |
| Osage | San Juan | Warren |
| Phelps | San Miguel | Washington |
| Reynolds | Sandoval | Wyandot |
| Saline | Santa Fe | |
| Schuyler | Socorro | OKLAHOMA: |
| Scott | Taos | Adair |
| Shannon | Union | Atoka |
| Stoddard | Valencia | Beckham |
| Sullivan | | Blaine |
| Washington | NEW YORK: | Bryan |
| Worth | Lewis | Caddo |
| Wright | Montgomery | Cherokee |
| | Schoharie | Choctaw |
| | Tioga | Cotton |
| | | Delaware |

TABLE G-1—*Cont.*
Head Start High Participation Counties

| | | |
|-----------------|------------------------|----------------|
| OKLAHOMA—Cont. | SOUTH DAKOTA— Cont. | TEXAS—Cont. |
| Harmon | Clay | Jim Hogg |
| Haskell | Corson | Karnes |
| Hughes | Dewey | Kinney |
| Jefferson | Hughes | Llano |
| Johnston | Jerauld | Lynn |
| Kiowa | Lyman | Madison |
| Latimer | Shannon | Mason |
| Le Flore | Todd | Matagorda |
| Logan | Walworth | Maverick |
| Love | Ziebach | Mills |
| Marshall | | Navarro |
| McClain | | Palo Pinto |
| McCurtain | TENNESSEE: | Potter |
| McIntosh | Bedford | Sabine |
| Murray | Benton | Starr |
| Noble | Cannon | Tom Green |
| Nowata | Chester | Upton |
| Okfuskee | Clay | Uvalde |
| Osage | Cumberland | Val Verde |
| Payne | De Kalb | Willacy |
| Pittsburg | Giles | Wilson |
| Pontotoc | Hancock | Zapata |
| Pottawatomie | Jackson | Zavala |
| Seminole | Macon | |
| Sequoyah | Meigs | UTAH: |
| Tillman | Moore | Carbon |
| Washita | Morgan | Emery |
| | Perry | San Juan |
| REGON: | Polk | Uintah |
| Hood River | Sequatchie | |
| Jefferson | Smith | VERMONT: |
| | Trousdale | Addison |
| PENNSYLVANIA: | Unicoi | Caledonia |
| Cameron | Weakley | Essex |
| Forest | White | |
| Franklin | TEXAS: | VIRGINIA: |
| Montour | Bailey | Bedford |
| Perry | Bastrop | Botetourt |
| Union | Bee | Craig |
| | Blanco | Fauquier |
| SOUTH CAROLINA: | Brown | Floyd |
| Abbeville | Burnet | Fredericksburg |
| Anderson | Cherokee | Galax |
| Cherokee | Childress | Giles |
| Chester | Clay | Grayson |
| Clarendon | Cottle | Lee |
| Fairfield | Crosby | Montgomery |
| Laurens | Dimmit | Norton |
| McCormick | Fannin | Orange |
| Newberry | Floyd | Rockbridge |
| Union | Gillespie | Russell |
| | Goliad | Scott |
| SOUTH DAKOTA: | Gray | Smyth |
| Aurora | Howard | Wise |
| Buffalo | | |

TABLE G-1—Cont.
Head Start High Participation Counties

| | | |
|-----------------------|-------------------|------------------------|
| WASHINGTON: | WISCONSIN: | WISCONSIN—Cont. |
| Asotin | Ashland | Washburn |
| Clallam | Bayfield | Waushara |
| Ferry | Douglas | Wood |
| Pend Oreille | Florence | |
| | Forest | |
| WEST VIRGINIA: | Iron | WYOMING: |
| Clay | Jackson | Converse |
| Hardy | Manitowoc | Fremont |
| McDowell | Menominee | Goshen |
| Mingo | Price | Hot Springs |
| Pendleton | Racine | Laramie |
| Taylor | Sauk | Niobrara |
| Wirt | Sawyer | Platte |
| | Vilas | Washakie |

TABLE G-2
Head Start Low Participation Counties

| | | |
|--------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| ALABAMA: | COLORADO—Cont. | GEORGIA—Cont. |
| Autauga | Elbert | Bleckley* |
| Bibb | Garfield | Brantley |
| Blount | Gilpin | Brooks |
| Chilton | Grand | Calhoun |
| Choctaw | Gunnison | Candler* |
| Clarke | Hinsdale | Charlton |
| Conecuh | Jackson | Clay |
| Dale* | Kiowa | Columbia |
| Fayette | Kit Carson | Cook* |
| Franklin | Lake | Crawford |
| Geneva | Lincoln | Crisp* |
| Hale | Logan | Decatur |
| Lamar | Moffat | Dooly |
| Limestone | Montrose* | Echols* |
| Marengo | Ouray | Effingham* |
| Marion | Park | Fayette |
| Randolph* | Phillips | Glascock |
| Shelby | Pitkin | Hancock* |
| Washington* | Prowers | Heard |
| Wilcox | Rio Blanco | Johnson |
| Winston | Routt | Jones |
| | San Juan | Lamar* |
| ARKANSAS: | San Miguel | Lee |
| Arkansas | Sedgwick | Lincoln |
| Calhoun | Summit | Madison* |
| Dallas | Teller | McIntosh |
| Grant | Washington | Miller |
| Howard | Yuma | Mitchell* |
| Lincoln | | Monroe |
| Lonoke | FLORIDA: | Montgomery* |
| Montgomery* | Calhoun | Murray* |
| Pike* | Citrus | Oconee |
| Prairie | Dixie | Pierce |
| Sevier | Franklin | Pike |
| Union | Gadsden | Quitman |
| | Gilchrist | Randolph* |
| CALIFORNIA: | Gulf | Richmond* |
| Amador* | Highlands | Seminole |
| Calaveras* | Jackson | Talbot |
| Mariposa | Jefferson | Taliaferro |
| San Benito* | Levy | Taylor |
| Sierra* | Liberty | Trentlen* |
| Trinity | Madison | Turner* |
| Tuolumne* | Monroe | Twiggs* |
| | Nassau | Warren |
| COLORADO: | Osceola | Wilkes |
| Baca | Santa Rosa | Wilkinson |
| Chaffee | Sumter* | |
| Cheyenne | Wakulla | IDAHO: |
| Clear Creek | | Adams |
| Custer | GEORGIA: | Bear Lake |
| Delta* | Atkinson | Blaine. |
| Dolores | Baker* | Boise |
| Douglas | Barrow* | Boundary |
| Eagle | Berrien* | |

*See footnote at end of table.

(276)

TABLE G-2—Cont.
Head Start Low Participation Counties

| IDAHO—Cont. | INDIANA—Cont. | KANSAS—Cont. |
|-------------|---------------|--------------|
| Butte | Huntington* | Edwards |
| Camas | Jasper | Elk |
| Caribou | Jennings* | Ellis |
| Clark | Johnson* | Ellsworth |
| Custer | Kosciusko | Gove* |
| Elmore | Lagrange | Graham; |
| Franklin | Marshall* | Gray |
| Fremont | Martin | Greeley |
| Jefferson | Miami | Greer,wood |
| Lemhi | Montgomery* | Hamilton |
| Lincoln | Morgan* | Harper |
| Madison | Newton* | Haskell |
| Oneida | Noble | Hodgeman |
| Owyhee | Porter | Jefferson |
| Teton | Posey | Jewell |
| Valley | Pulaski | Kearny |
| | Rush* | Kingman |
| ILLINOIS: | Scott* | Kiowa |
| Boone | Shelby* | Lane |
| Bureau* | Starke* | Leavenworth |
| Carroll | Tipton | Lincoln |
| Crawford | Union | Logan* |
| De Witt | Wabash | Marion |
| Douglas | White | Marshall |
| Ford | Whitley | McPherson |
| Gallatin* | | Meade |
| Grundy | IOWA: | Mitchell |
| Hardin* | Butler | Morris |
| Henderson* | Cass* | Morton |
| Jasper | Cedar* | Ness |
| Kendall | Fremont | Norton |
| Marshall | Grundy | Osborne |
| McDonough* | Hardin* | Ottawa |
| Menard | Mills | Pawnee |
| Pope* | Mitchell | Phillips |
| Putnam | Montgomery | Pottawatomie |
| Scott* | Page | Pratt |
| Stark* | Taylor | Rawlins* |
| Woodford* | Worth | Republic |
| INDIANA: | KANSAS: | Rice |
| Benton | Anderson | Rooks |
| Boone | Barber | Rush |
| Carroll | Barton | Russell |
| Cass | Chase | Saline |
| Clinton | Chautauqua | Seward* |
| Decatur* | Cheyenne | Sheridan* |
| Elkhart | Clark | Smita |
| Fayette | Clay | Stafford |
| Franklin | Cloud | Stanton |
| Fulton | Coffey | Stevens |
| Gibson | Comanche | Sumner |
| Hamilton | Cowley | Thomas* |
| Hendricks | Decatur* | Trego* |
| Howard | Dickinson | Wabaunsee |

*See footnote at end of table.

TABLE G-2—*Cont.*
Head Start Low Participation Counties

| | | |
|------------------|----------------|------------|
| KANSAS—Cont. | MASSACHUSETTS: | NEBRASKA: |
| Wallace* | Dukes | Antelope* |
| Washington | MINNESOTA: | Arthur |
| Wilson | Dakota* | Banner |
| Woodson | Freeborn | Blaine |
| KENTUCKY: | Mower* | Boone* |
| Bullitt | Olmsted* | Boyd |
| Caldwell | Washington* | Brown* |
| Crittenden | MISSOURI: | Butler |
| Gallatin | Barton | Chase |
| Garrard* | Montgomery | Cherry* |
| Harrison* | Warren | Clay |
| Henry | MONTANA: | Colfax |
| Livingston | Beaverhead | Cuming |
| Meade | Big Horn* | Dawson |
| Metcalfe | Broadwater | Deuel |
| Owen | Carbon | Dixon |
| Pendleton | Carter | Dundy |
| Rockcastle* | Chouteau | Franklin |
| Scott | Custer | Frontier |
| Shelby | Daniels | Furnas |
| Spencer | Dawson | Garden* |
| Todd | Fallon | Garfield |
| LOUISIANA: | Fergus | Gosper |
| Assumption | Gallatin | Grant |
| Bienville* | Garfield | Hamilton* |
| Caldwell | Golden Valley | Harlan |
| Cameron | Granite* | Hayes |
| Claiborne | Jefferson | Hitchcock |
| Concordia | Judith Basin | Holt |
| East Feliciana | Liberty | Hooker |
| Franklin | Lincoln | Johnson |
| Grant | Madison | Kearney |
| Jackson* | McCone | Keith |
| Lafourche | Meagher | Keya Paha |
| Livingston | Musselshell | Lincoln |
| Madison | Park | Logan |
| Plaquemines | Petroleum | Loup |
| Red River* | Phillips | Madison* |
| Richland | Powder River | McPherson |
| Sabine | Powell | Nance |
| St. Bernard | Prairie | Nuckolls |
| Tensas | Richland | Otoe* |
| Terrebonne | Sanders | Pawnee |
| Union | Sheridan | Perkins |
| West Baton Rouge | Stillwater | Phelps |
| West Carroll | Sweet Grass | Pierce |
| West Feliciana | Teton | Platte* |
| Winn* | Toole | Polk |
| MARYLAND: | Treasure | Red Willow |
| Caroline | Wheatland | Rock |
| | Wibaux | Sarpy |
| | | Saunders |
| | | Seward |
| | | Stanton |
| | | Thomas |

*See footnote at end of table.

TABLE G-2—Cont.
Head Start Low Participation Counties

| | | |
|-----------------|----------------------|-----------------|
| NEBRASKA—Cont. | NORTH CAROLINA—Cont. | OKLAHOMA—Cont. |
| Washington | Tyrrell | Harper |
| Wayne | Wilkes* | Kay* |
| York | Wilson* | Major |
| NEVADA: | | Roger Mills* |
| Carson City | NORTH DAKOTA: | Texas |
| Esmeralda | Adams | Woods |
| Eureka | Barnes | Woodward |
| Lander | Billings | OREGON: |
| Lincoln | Bowman | Benton* |
| Nye | Burke | Crook |
| Pershing | Cavalier | Curry |
| NEW MEXICO: | Dickey | Deschutes* |
| De Baca | Divide | Gilliam |
| Harding | Eddy | Grant |
| Hidalgo* | Emmons | Harney |
| Lea* | Foster | Lake |
| Lincoln | Golden Valley | Lincoln* |
| Los Alamos | Griggs | Morrow |
| Luna | Hettinger | Sherman |
| Sierra* | Kidder | Tillamook* |
| Torrance | La Moure | Wallowa |
| NEW YORK: | Logan | Wasco |
| Allegany* | McIntosh | Wheeler |
| Genesee | Nelson | PENNSYLVANIA: |
| Hamilton* | Oliver | Northumberland* |
| Herkimer* | Pembina | Pike |
| Livingston | Ramsey* | Wayne* |
| Putnam | Ransom | Wyoming |
| Seneca | Renville | |
| Wyoming | Richland* | SOUTH DAKOTA: |
| Yates | Sargent | Bon Homme* |
| NORTH CAROLINA: | Sheridan | Campbell |
| Alexander* | Slope | Clark |
| Alleghany | Stark | Deuel |
| Ashe* | Steele | Grant* |
| Bertie | Stutsman* | Haakon |
| Camden | Towner | Hamlin |
| Casswell | Traill | Hanson* |
| Currituck | Walsh | Harding |
| Davidson | Welis | Hyde |
| Halifax | OHIO: | Jackson |
| Hertford | Medina* | Jones |
| Lincoln | Union* | Lincoln* |
| Northampton | OKLAHOMA: | McCook |
| Parson | Alfalfa | Moody* |
| Polk | Beaver | Perkins |
| Randolph | Cimarron | Potter |
| Rutherford | Dewey | Stanley* |
| Stanly* | Ellis | Sully* |
| Transylvania | Garfield | TENNESSEE: |
| | Garvin | Cheatham |
| | Grant | Crockett* |

*See footnote at end of table.

TABLE G-2—Cont.
Head Start Low Participation Counties

| TENNESSEE—Cont. | TEXAS—Cont. | TEXAS—Cont. |
|-----------------|-------------|--------------|
| Dickson | Grayson | Rockwall |
| Hardeman* | Hamilton | San Jacinto |
| Hickman* | Hansford | Schleicher |
| Lewis* | Hardin | Scurry |
| Madison | Hartley | Shackelford |
| Marshall* | Haskell | Sherman |
| Montgomery* | Hemphill | Somervell |
| Robertson | Henderson | Stephens |
| Sumner* | Hood | Sterling |
| Van Buren | Hopkins | Stonewall |
| | Houston | Sutton |
| TEXAS: | Hudspeth | Terrell |
| Anderson | Hunt | Throckmorton |
| Andrews | Irion | Titus |
| Aransas | Jack | Trinity |
| Archer | Jackson | Tyler |
| Armstrong | Jasper* | Upshur |
| Austin | Jeff Davis | Van Zandt |
| Bandera | Johnson | Walker |
| Baylor | Jones | Waller |
| Borden | Kendall | Ward |
| Brewster | Kenedy | Wheeler |
| Briscoe | Kent | Winkler |
| Calhoun | Kerr | Wise |
| Callahan | Kimble | Wood |
| Camp | King | Yoakum |
| Carson | Knox | Young |
| Castro | Lamar | |
| Chambers | Lamb | UTAH: |
| Coke | Lavaca | Beaver |
| Collingsworth | Lee | Daggett |
| Colorado | Lipscomb | Garfield* |
| Comanche* | Live Oak | Iron* |
| Concho | McMullen | Juab |
| Coryell | Menard | Kane |
| Crane | Milam | Millard* |
| Crockett | Mitchell | Morgan |
| Culberson | Montgomery | Piute |
| De Witt | Moore* | Rich |
| Delta | Morris | Sanpete |
| Dorley | Motley | Sevier* |
| Duval* | Newton* | Summit |
| Eastland* | Nolan | Tooele |
| Edwards | Ochiltree | Washington* |
| Ellis | Oldham | Wayne |
| Erath | Parker | |
| Falls* | Parmer | VERMONT: |
| Fayette | Pecos | Grand Isle |
| Fisher | Presidio | |
| Foard | Rains | VIRGINIA: |
| Franklin | Randall | Accomack* |
| Freestone | Reagan | Amelia |
| Gaines | Refugio | Amherst |
| Glasscock | Roberts | Appomattox |
| | | Augusta |

*See footnote at end of table.

TABLE G-2—Cont.
Head Start Low Participation Counties

| VIRGINIA—Cont. | VIRGINIA—Cont. | WASHINGTON—Cont. |
|------------------|----------------|------------------|
| Bath | Lunenburg | Lewis |
| Bedford* | Madison | Lincoln |
| Brunswick | Manassas | Pacific |
| Buchanan | Manassas Park | San Juan |
| Buena Vista | Martinsville | Skamania |
| Campbell | Mathews | Wahkiakum |
| Caroline | Mecklenburg | Whitman |
| Charlotte | Middlesex | |
| Clarke | Nelson | WEST VIRGINIA: |
| Clifton Forge | Northampton* | Greenbrier* |
| Colonial Heights | Northumberland | Jefferson |
| Covington | Nottoway | Lewis |
| Culpeper | Page | Pocahontas |
| Cumberland* | Patrick | Summers |
| Dickenson | Petersburg | Webster |
| Dinwiddie | Poquoson | |
| Emporia | Powhatan | WISCONSIN: |
| Essex | Prince George | Calumet |
| Fairfax | Prince William | Clark |
| Falls Church | Radford* | Door |
| Fluvanna* | Rappahannock | Green |
| Franklin* | Richmond | Green Lake* |
| Frederick | Rockingham* | Kewaunee |
| Gloucester | Shenandoah | Langlade* |
| Greene | South Boston | Oneida* |
| Greensville | Spotsylvania | Ozaukee |
| Halifax | Staunton | |
| Hampton* | Surry | WYOMING: |
| Hanover | Sussex | Campbell |
| Harrisonburg | Tazewell* | Crook |
| Henry | Warren | Johnson |
| Highland | Waynesboro | Lincoln |
| Hopewell | Westmoreland | Sheridan |
| King And Queen | Winchester | Sublette |
| King George | | Sweetwater |
| King William | WASHINGTON: | Teton |
| Lancaster | Adams | Uinta |
| Lexington | Columbia | Weston |
| | Garfield | |

*Counties in which a new Head Start program was instituted in fiscal year 1985.

TABLE G-3
Child Poverty Counties With High Participation in Head Start

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| ALABAMA: Greene Lowndes Macon Montgomery Pickens Sumter | KENTUCKY—Cont. Lee Magoffin Martin Menifee Morgan Owsley Powell Robertson Washington Wolfe | MISSISSIPPI—Cont. Newton Noxubee Pearl River Perry Pike Quitman Scott Sharkey Smith Sunflower Tate Tunica Walthall Washington Wayne Wilkinson Winston Yalobusha Yazoo |
| ARIZONA: Apache Navajo | LOUISIANA: Acadia Catahoula Iberville St. Helena St. Landry | MISSOURI: Carter Douglas Dunklin Mississippi Reynolds Shannon Worth Wright |
| ARKANSAS: Fulton Scott Searcy | MICHIGAN: Lake | MONTANA: Blaine Glacier |
| COLORADO: Conejos Costilla Huerfano Las Animas Otero Saguache | MISSISSIPPI: Adams Amite Attala Benton Bolivar Calhoun Carroll Choctaw Claiborne Clay Coahoma Copiah Forrest Franklin Greene Grenada Holmes Humphreys Issaquena Jasper Jefferson Jefferson Davis Kemper Lauderdale Leake Leflore Lincoln Lowndes Madison Marion Marshall Montgomery Neshoba | NEBRASKA: Greeley Thurston |
| FLORIDA: De Soto Taylor | | NEW MEXICO: Guadalupe McKinley Mora Rio Arriba San Miguel Socorro Taos Union |
| GEORGIA: Clinch Morgan Pulaski Schley Stewart Towns Washington Webster Worth | | NORTH CAROLINA: Madison Martin Swain Vance |
| IDAHO: Washington | | |
| ILLINOIS: Alexander Pulaski | | |
| KENTUCKY: Bath Breckinridge Cumberland Elliott Fleming Jackson Johnson Knott Knox | | |

(282)

TABLE G-3—*Cont.*

Child Poverty Counties With High Participation in Head Start

| | | |
|------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| NORTH DAKOTA: | SOUTH DAKOTA: | TEXAS—Cont. |
| Rolette | Aurora | Madison |
| Sioux | Buffalo | Mason |
| | Corson | Maverick |
| OHIO: | Dewey | Mills |
| Pike | Lyman | Starr |
| | Shannon | Upton |
| OKLAHOMA: | Todd | Uvalde |
| Adair | Ziebach | Val Verde |
| Atoka | | Willacy |
| Caddo | TENNESSEE: | Zapata |
| Choctaw | Clay | Zavala |
| Delaware | Cumberland | |
| Harmon | Hancock | UTAH: |
| Hughes | Jackson | San Juan |
| Johnston | Morgan | |
| Kiowa | | VIRGINIA: |
| Latimer | TEXAS: | Lee |
| Marshall | Bailey | |
| McCurtain | Bee | WEST VIRGINIA: |
| McIntosh | Cottle | Clay |
| Tillman | Crosby | McDowell |
| | Dimmit | Mingo |
| SOUTH CAROLINA: | Floyd | Pendleton |
| Clarendon | Karnes | |
| Fairfield | Kinney | |
| McCormick | Lynn | |

TABLE G-4
Child Poverty Counties With Low Participation in Head Start

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| ALABAMA: Bibb Choctaw ^a Clarke Conecuh Hale Marengo Randolph Washington Wilcox | GEORGIA—Cont. Seminole Talbot Taliaferro Taylor Treutlen Turner Warren | NORTH CAROLINA: Bertie Halifax Hertford Northampton Pitt Tyrrell Wilson |
| ARKANSAS: Arkansas Calhoun Lincoln Prairie | IDAHO: Owyhee | NORTH DAKOTA: Billings Emmons Hettinger Kidder Logan McIntosh Sheridan Slope |
| COLORADO: Baca Dolores | KENTUCKY: Metcalf Owen Rockcastle | SOUTH DAKOTA: Bon Homme Campbell Clark Deuel Hamlin Hanson Harding Hyde Jackson Potter Sully |
| FLORIDA: Calhoun Dixie Franklin Gadsden Gulf Highlands Jackson Jefferson Levy Liberty Madison Sumter | LOUISIANA: Bienville Caldwell Claiborne Concordia East Feliciana Franklin Madison Red River Richland Sabine Tensas West Carroll West Feliciana Winn | TENNESSEE: Hardeman |
| GEORGIA: Atkinson Baker Brooks Calhoun Candler Charlton Clay Crisp Decatur Dooly Echols Hancock Johnson Lincoln McIntosh Miller Mitchell Montgomery Pierce Quitman Randolph | MONTANA: Carter Garfield Judith Basin Petroleum Prairie Treasure | TEXAS: Briscoe Castro Collingsworth Concho De Witt Duval Edwards Falls Gaines Glasscock Haskell Houston Hudspeth Jeff Davis Kenedy King Knox Lamb Menard Mitchell Motley |
| | NEBRASKA: Arthur Banner Blaine Boyd Hayes Logan | |
| | NEVADA: Eureka | |
| | NEW MEXICO: De Baca Luna Sierra Torrance | |

(284)

TABLE G-4—*Cont.*

Child Poverty Counties With Low Participation in Head Start

| | | |
|-------------|----------------|----------------|
| TEXAS—Cont. | VIRGINIA—Cont. | VIRGINIA—Cont. |
| Parmer | Charlotte | Surry |
| Presidio | Cumberland | Sussex |
| San Jacinto | Franklin | Westmoreland |
| | Greensville | |
| VIRGINIA: | Northampton | WEST VIRGINIA: |
| Accomack | Petersburg | Summers |
| Brunswick | | Webster |

APPENDIX H

Tables Relating to Participation in WIC

| | Page |
|---|------|
| Table H-1—WIC High Participation Counties | 289 |
| Table H-2—WIC Low Participation Counties | 294 |
| Table H-3—Child Poverty Counties With High Participation In WIC . | 299 |
| Table H-4—Child Poverty Counties Low High Participation In WIC... | 300 |

(287)

288

TABLE H-1
WIC High Participation Counties

| | | |
|---------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| ALABAMA: | GEORGIA—Cont. | ILLINOIS—Cont. |
| Cherokee | Butts | Jo Daviess |
| Coffee | Calhoun | Johnson |
| Colbert | Charlton | Lee |
| Covington | Cherokee | Logan |
| Escambia | Clay | Massac |
| Franklin | Cook | Menard |
| Henry | Crawford | Monroe |
| Lauderdale | Dawson | Montgomery |
| Marion | Evans | Perry |
| Winston | Floyd | Pike |
| | Forsyth | Pope |
| CALIFORNIA: | Hall | Putnam |
| Alpine | Hancock | Randolph |
| Amador | Haralson | Stephenson |
| Del Norte | Harris | Union |
| San Benito | Irwin | Wabash |
| Santa Cruz | Jackson | |
| Sierra | Jeff Davis | INDIANA: |
| Trinity | Lee | Blackford |
| | Madison | Boone |
| COLORADO: | Miller | Brown |
| Bent | Morgan | Clay |
| Chaffee | Pickens | Dubois |
| Crowley | Polk | Franklin |
| Fremont | Quitman | Hendricks |
| Lake | Randolph | Jay |
| Larimer | Schley | Jennings |
| Morgan | Stephens | Ohio |
| Otero | Stewart | Owen |
| Park | Talbot | Pike |
| Prowers | Taliaferro | Porter |
| Pueblo | Twiggs | Putnam |
| Routt | Wayne | Randolph |
| Saguache | White | Scott |
| Sedgwick | Whitfield | Warrick |
| | Wilkinson | Wells |
| CONNECTICUT: | IDAHO: | IOWA: |
| Tolland | Clark | Buena Vista |
| Windham | Lewis | Carroll |
| | Valley | Clinton |
| FLORIDA: | ILLINOIS: | Dallas |
| Collier | Adams | Decatur |
| Gilchrist | Alexander | Des Moines |
| Martin | Bond | Fayette |
| Nassau | Bureau | Linn |
| Okeechobee | Cass | Monona |
| Pasco | Effingham | Montgomery |
| GEORGIA: | Fulton | Page |
| Atkinson | Grundy | Story |
| Bacon | Hardin | Union |
| Baker | Henderson | Wapello |
| Banks | Jasper | |
| Barrow | Jersey | |
| Brantley | | |
| Bryan | | |

(289)

TABLE H-1—*Cont.*
WIC High Participation Counties

| | | |
|-------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| KANSAS: | MARYLAND—Cont. | MINNESOTA—Cont. |
| Allen | Charles | Cook |
| Chase | Garrett | Crow Wing |
| Chautauqua | Howard | Goodhue |
| Cherokee | Kent | Grant |
| Crawford | Montgomery | Itasca |
| Finney | Washington | Kandiyohi |
| Neosho | | Koochiching |
| Osage | MICHIGAN: | Lake |
| Saline | Alger | Mille Lacs |
| Shawnee | Alpena | Olmsted |
| Sherman | Antrim | Polk |
| Stevens | Bay | Ramsey |
| Thomas | Benzie | Rice |
| Wabasha | Charlevoix | Scott |
| | Cheboygan | St. Louis |
| KENTUCKY: | Chippewa | Wilkin |
| Anderson | Crawford | Wright |
| Ballard | Delta | |
| Butler | Dickinson | MISSISSIPPI: |
| Caldwell | Emmet | Benton |
| Calloway | Gage | Chickasaw |
| Estill | Grand Traverse | Claiborne |
| Fleming | Houghton | Clay |
| Gallatin | Huron | Franklin |
| Grant | Iron | Greene |
| Lee | Kalamazoo | Grenada |
| Livingston | Keweenaw | Itawamba |
| Marshall | Lake | Jasper |
| Martin | Lapeer | Jefferson |
| McCracken | Luce | Lafayette |
| McLean | Mackinac | Lawrence |
| Perry | Manistee | Leake |
| Robertson | Marquette | Lee |
| Rowan | Mason | Montgomery |
| Trigg | Menominee | Newton |
| Union | Oceana | Noxubee |
| Wolfe | Ontonagon | Perry |
| LOUISIANA: | Osceola | Prentiss |
| Allen | Oscoda | Tallahatchie |
| Bossier | Otsego | Tishomingo |
| Caldwell | Roscommon | Warren |
| East Carroll | Sanilac | Webster |
| Evangeline | Schoolcraft | Winston |
| Red River | Shiawassee | Yalobusha |
| St. Bernard | St. Clair | |
| St. Helena | Tuscola | MISSOURI: |
| St. James | Washtenaw | Audrain |
| Washington | | Bollinger |
| Webster | MINNESOTA: | Boone |
| | Aitkin | Carroll |
| MARYLAND: | Anoka | Carter |
| Allegany | Becker | Christian |
| Calvert | Big Stone | Dade |
| Carroll | Cass | Gasconade |
| | Clay | Henry |

TABLE H-1—*Cont.*
WIC High Participation Counties

| | | |
|----------------|-----------------|---------------|
| MISSOURI—Cont. | NEW JERSEY: | NORTH DAKOTA— |
| Holt | Sussex | Cont. |
| Howard | Warren | Morton |
| Lafayette | NEW MEXICO: | Pembina |
| Lewis | Union | Pierce |
| Linn | NEW YORK: | Ramsey |
| Macon | Chautauqua | Richland |
| Madison | Chenango | Rolette |
| Moniteau | Franklin | Sargent |
| Montgomery | Herkimer | Slope |
| Perry | Madison | Steele |
| Pettis | Orleans | Towner |
| Phelps | Schoharie | Walsh |
| Ralls | Sullivan | Ward |
| Ray | | OHIO: |
| Reynolds | NORTH CAROLINA: | Auglaize |
| St. Francois | Alamance | Clark |
| Stoddard | Alexander | Crawford |
| Stone | Alleghany | Darke |
| Warren | Anson | Er. |
| Washington | Ashe | Galua |
| Wayne | Avery | Guernsey |
| Wright | Chatham | Harrison |
| MONTANA: | Dare | Henry |
| Jefferson | Davie | Hocking |
| Sanders | Graham | Jackson |
| Silver Bow | Granville | Mahoning |
| NEBRASKA: | Hertford | Meigs |
| Adams | Jackson | Mercer |
| Dakota | Jones | Miami |
| Dawes | Lincoln | Monroe |
| Hall | Macon | Morgan |
| Hamilton | Madison | Morrow |
| Keith | Mitchell | Noble |
| Keya Paha | Montgomery | Paulding |
| Lincoln | Moore | Perry |
| NEVADA: | Pasquotank | Pickaway |
| Carson City | Pender | Pike |
| Douglas | Person | Preble |
| Esmeralda | Richmond | Putnam |
| Humboldt | Scotland | Ross |
| Lincoln | Swain | Tuscarawas |
| Lyon | Tyrrell | Van Wert |
| Pershing | Watauga | Vinton |
| Storey | Wilkes | Washington |
| Washoe | Yadkin | OKLAHOMA: |
| NEW HAMPSHIRE: | Yancey | Atoka |
| Carroll | NORTH DAKOTA: | Beckham |
| Coos | Burleigh | Garvin |
| Grafton | Cass | Greer |
| Sullivan | Cavalier | Haskell |
| | Divide | Kingfisher |
| | Grand Forks | Logan |
| | McHenry | Love |

TABLE H-1—*Cont.*
WIC High Participation Counties

| | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| OKLAHOMA—Cont. | TENNESSEE—Cont. | VIRGINIA: |
| Murray | Pickett | Accomack |
| Nowata | Smith | Alleghany |
| Pushmataha | Stewart | Amelia |
| Texas | Trousdale | Bedford |
| Tillman | Unicoi | Botetourt |
| | Van Buren | Buckingham |
| PENNSYLVANIA: | TEXAS: | Buena Vista |
| Blair | Bailey | Charles City |
| Cameron | Bee | Charlottesville |
| Elk | Comanche | Covington |
| Fayette | Culberson | Craig |
| Greene | Denton | Fairfax |
| Juniata | Dimmit | Falls Church |
| Fike | Garza | Franklin |
| Sullivan | Gonzales | Fredericksburg |
| Washington | Hays | Goochland |
| Westmoreland | Jackson | Greene |
| Wyoming | Jim Hogg | Halifax |
| RHODE ISLAND: | La Salle | Hopewell |
| Bristol | Martin | Louisa |
| SOUTH CAROLINA: | McMullen | Madison |
| Abbeville | Mills | Manassas Park |
| Allendale | Randall | Martinsville |
| Berkeley | Refugio | Mathews |
| Cherokee | San Patricio | Nelson |
| Chester | San Saba | Poquoson |
| Clarendon | Terrell | Portsmouth |
| Dorchester | Tom Green | Powhatan |
| Fairfield | Travis | Radford |
| Lancaster | Willacy | Rappahannock |
| Laurens | Winkler | Richmond County |
| McCormick | Zapata | South Boston |
| Newberry | Zavala | Staunton |
| Orangeburg | UTAH: | Surry |
| Pickens | Laggett | Sussex |
| Spartanburg | Piute | WASHINGTON: |
| Union | VERMONT: | Chelan |
| York | Addison | Columbia |
| SOUTH DAKOTA: | Bennington | Garfield |
| Hughes | Caledonia | WEST VIRGINIA: |
| Lyman | Chittenden | Calhoun |
| Pennington | Essex | Gilmer |
| TENNESSEE: | Franklin | Pocahontas |
| Benton | Grand Isle | Randolph |
| Chester | Lamoille | Roane |
| Decatur | Orange | Upshur |
| Houston | Orleans | Wirt |
| Jackson | Rutland | WISCONSIN: |
| Lewis | Washington | Ashland |
| Loudon | Windham | Bayfield |
| Meigs | Windsor | Brown |
| | | Burnett |

TABLE H-1—*Cont.*
WIC High Participation Counties

| WISCONSIN—Cont. | WISCONSIN—Cont. | WISCONSIN—Cont. |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Door | Marquette | Walworth |
| Eau Claire | Menominee | Waushara |
| Florence | Oneida | |
| Fond du Lac | Pepin | WYOMING: |
| Forest | Portage | Campbell |
| Jackson | Price | Carbon |
| Jefferson | Racine | Goshen |
| Juneau | Rock | Hot Springs |
| Kewaunee | Rusk | Laramie |
| La Crosse | Sawyer | Natrona |
| Langlade | Sheboygan | Platte |
| Lincoln | St. Croix | Sheridan |
| Marathon | Trempealeau | Uinta |
| Marinette | Vilas | Washakie |

TABLE H-2
WIC Low Participation Counties

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| ALABAMA: Madison Mobile | COLORADO—Cont. Denver Eagle Elbert* Garfield* Grand Jackson Kiowa La Plata Mesa Mineral Montrose Pitkin Rio Blanco Rio Grande Summit Weld | IDAHO—Cont. Kootenai Lincoln Madison Oneida Power Shoshone Teton |
| ARIZONA: Apache Maricopa Mohave Navajo Pima | | ILLINOIS: Clark Douglas Edgar Kankakee Kendall McDonough Mercer |
| ARKANSAS: Boone Bradley Calhoun Carroll Cleburne Garland Greene Jackson Lee Logan Madison Mississippi Polk Sebastian Stone White Woodruff | DELAWARE: New Castle | INDIANA: Benton* Carroll* Cass* Clark* Clinton* Fountain* Hamilton* Hancock* Harrison* Jackson* Jasper Johnson* Kosciusko* Lagrange* Lawrence* Marshall Miami* Montgomery* Morgan* Newton* Posey Pulaski* Rush* Shelby* Starke* Tippecanoe* Tipton* Union Vermillion* Warren* Washington White* |
| CALIFORNIA: Butte Calaveras Fresno Lassen Los Angeles Mariposa Orange Placer Riverside Sacramento San Bernardino San Diego San Joaquin Santa Clara Solano Tehama Tulare Yolo | FLORIDA: Charlotte Clay Duval Escambia Flagler Hamilton Highlands Monroe Orange Pinellas Santa Rosa Sarasota Suwannee | |
| | GEORGIA: Camden | |
| COLORADO: Archuleta Cheyenne Clear Creek* Conejos Costilla Delta | HAWAII: Hawaii Honolulu Kauai | |
| | IDAHO: Blaine Bonner Boundary Butte Camas Caribou Franklin Fremont Gooding Idaho Jefferson | IOWA: Cedar Grundy |

*See footnote at end of table.

(294)

TABLE H-2—Cont.
WIC Low Participation Counties

| | | |
|---------------|------------------|----------------------|
| IOWA—Cont. | KANSAS—Cont. | MINNESOTA—Cont. |
| Lyon | Rush* | Renville* |
| Washington | Russell* | Rock |
| KANSAS: | Scott | Sibley* |
| Anderson* | Seward* | Watonwan* |
| Barber* | Sheridan* | MISSISSIPPI: |
| Barton* | Smith* | Marshall |
| Butler* | Stafford* | MISSOURI: |
| Clark* | Stanton* | Pike |
| Clay* | Sumner* | MONTANA: |
| Cloud* | Trego* | Blaine |
| Coffey* | Washington* | Carbon |
| Comanche* | Wilson* | Carter* |
| Decatur* | Woodson* | Daniels* |
| Edwards* | KENTUCKY: | Fallon* |
| Elk* | Fayette | Fergus* |
| Ellis | Greenup | Garfield |
| Ellsworth* | Hardin | Glacier |
| Geary* | Lewis | Golden Valley |
| Gove* | Meade | Judith Basin |
| Graham* | Mercer | Liberty |
| Gray* | Nelson | Madison |
| Hamilton* | Pike | McCone |
| Harper* | Taylor | Musselshell |
| Haskell | Washington | Petroleum |
| Hodgeman* | Woodford | Pondera |
| Jewell* | LOUISIANA: | Prairie |
| Johnson | Jefferson | Roosevelt |
| Kingman* | Lafayette | Rosebud |
| Kiowa* | Orleans | Sheridan |
| Lane* | Plaquemines | Sweet Grass |
| Leavenworth | West Baton Rouge | Toole |
| Lincoln* | MAINE: | Treasure |
| Linn* | Waldo | Valley |
| Logan | MASSACHUSETTS: | Wheatland |
| Marion* | Nantucket | Wibaux |
| McPherson* | Norfolk | Yellowstone National |
| Meade* | MICHIGAN: | Park |
| Miami* | Isabella | NEBRASKA: |
| Mitchell* | Kent | Arthur |
| Morris* | Muskegon | Banner |
| Morton* | MINNESOTA: | Blaine |
| Ness* | Benton | Boone* |
| Norton* | Chisago* | Butler |
| Osborne* | Cottonwood* | Cedar |
| Ottawa* | Faribault* | Chase |
| Pawnee* | Jackson* | Colfax |
| Phillips* | Kanabec* | Cuming |
| Pottawatomie* | Lincoln | Deuel |
| Pratt* | Martin* | Dixon |
| Rawlins* | Meeker | Dundy |
| Republic* | | Frontier |
| Rice* | | |
| Rooks* | | |

*See footnote at end of table.

TABLE H-2—Cont.
WIC Low Participation Counties

| | | |
|----------------|------------------|--------------------|
| NEBRASKA—Cont. | NEW MEXICO—Cont. | PENNSYLVANIA—Cont. |
| Furnas | Socorro | Delaware |
| Garden | Valencia | Forest |
| Garfield | NEW YORK: | Montour* |
| Gosper | Nassau | Northumberland |
| Grant | Putnam | Snyder* |
| Greeley | NORTH DAKOTA: | Union* |
| Hayes | Benson | SOUTH DAKOTA: |
| Hitchcock | Dunn | Buffalo |
| Hooker | Golden Valley | Campbell |
| Jefferson | Grant | Clark |
| Knox | Logan | Corson |
| Logan | Oliver | Deuel |
| McPherson | Sioux | Dewey |
| Nance | Stark | Douglas |
| Pawnee* | OHIO: | Faulk |
| Perkins | Fulton | Hamlin |
| Pierce | Geauga | Hand |
| Polk | Holmes | Hanson |
| Saline | OKLAHOMA: | Harding |
| Sarpy | Alfalfa | Hutchinson |
| Saunders | Beaver | Jackson* |
| Sioux | Blaine | Kingsbury |
| Thayer* | Canadian | Marshall |
| Thomas | Cimarron | Mellette |
| Valley | Delaware | Shannon |
| Washington | Dewey | Todd |
| Wayne | Ellis | Tripp |
| Webster | Grant | Ziebach |
| NEVADA: | Harper | TENNESSEE: |
| Eureka | Oklahoma | Davidson* |
| Nye | Osage | Dyer* |
| NEW JERSEY: | Pawnee | Shelby |
| Bergen | Roger Mills | TEXAS: |
| Camden | Washington | Anderson |
| Middlesex | Woodward | Angelina* |
| Morris | OREGON: | Archer* |
| Ocean | Baker | Armstrong |
| Somerset | Benton | Austin |
| NEW MEXICO: | Columbia | Bandera |
| Bernalillo | Curry | Baylor* |
| Catron | Gilliam* | Bexar |
| Chaves | Grant* | Blanco |
| Dona Ana | Harney | Borden* |
| Lea | Jackson | Bosque |
| Lincoln | Lake* | Bowie |
| Los Alamos | Linn | Briscoe |
| McKinley | Wheeler* | Brown* |
| Otero | PENNSYLVANIA: | Burleson* |
| Quay | Berks | Burnet |
| San Juan | Clinton | Callahan* |
| Santa Fe | | Camp* |

*See footnote at end of table.

TABLE H-2—Cont.
WIC Low Participation Counties

| TEXAS—Cont. | TEXAS—Cont. | TEXAS—Cont. |
|---------------|-------------|-------------------|
| Carson | Irion | Sabine |
| Cass* | Jack | San Augustine |
| Chambers | Jasper* | San Jacinto* |
| Cherokee* | Johnson* | Schleicher |
| Childress* | Jones* | Scurry* |
| Clay* | Karnes | Shackelford* |
| Coke | Kaufman* | Shelby |
| Coleman* | Kendall | Sherman |
| Collin | Kenedy | Somervell* |
| Collingsworth | Kent* | Stephens* |
| Colorado | Kerr | Sterling |
| Comal | Kimble | Stonewall |
| Concho | King | Sutton |
| Cooke* | Knox* | Swisher |
| Coryell | Lamar | Throckmorton* |
| Cottle* | Lampasas* | Titus* |
| Crockett | Lavaca | Trinity* |
| Dallam | Lee | Tyler* |
| Delta | Leon* | Uvalde* |
| Dickens* | Liberty | Van Zandt |
| Donley | Limestone | Waller |
| Eastland* | Lipscomb | Washington* |
| Ector | Live Oak | Wharton |
| Edwards | Llano | Wheeler |
| Ellis* | Madison | Wilbarger* |
| Erath* | Mason | Wilson |
| Falls* | McCulloch* | Wise* |
| Fannin* | Medina | Wood |
| Fayette* | Menard | Young* |
| Fisher* | Midland | |
| Foard* | Milam* | UTAH: |
| Franklin | Mitchell* | Beaver |
| Freestone | Montague* | Rich |
| Galveston* | Moore | San Juan |
| Gillespie | Morris | Sevier |
| Gray | Motley | Utah |
| Guadalupe* | Nacogdoches | Wayne |
| Hall | Navarro* | |
| Hamilton | Newton* | VIRGINIA: |
| Hansford | Nolan* | Albemarle* |
| Hardeman* | Ochiltree | Bath |
| Hardin | Oldham | Bedford |
| Harris | Orange | Bristol |
| Harrison* | Palo Pinto* | Buchanan |
| Hartley | Parker* | Chesapeake |
| Haskell* | Polk | Clarke |
| Hemphill | Rains | Colonial Heights* |
| Henderson* | Reagan | Danville* |
| Hood* | Real | Emporia* |
| Hopkins | Red River | Fairfax |
| Houston* | Roberts | Hampton |
| Howard | Rockwall* | Harrisonburg |
| Hunt* | Runnels* | Highland |
| Hutchinson | Rusk | James City* |
| | | Lexington* |

*See footnote at end of table.

TABLE H-2—*Cont.*
WIC Low Participation Counties

VIRGINIA—Cont.

Loudoun
Lynchburg*
Manassas*
Newport News*
Norfolk
Norton*
Roanoke*
Rockingham
Shenandoah
Southampton
Suffolk
Virginia Beach*
Waynesboro*
Winchester*
York*

WASHINGTON:

Asotin
Benton
Clark
Ferry
Garfield
Island
Jefferson
Kitsap
Lincoln
Mason
Pacific
Pierce
Thurston
Whitman

WEST VIRGINIA:

Hancock
Harrison
Jefferson
Marion
Preston
Wayne

WISCONSIN:

Calumet*

WYOMING:

Lincoln
Sublette*
Teton*

*Counties in which a new WIC program had been instituted as of September, 1986.

TABLE H-3
Child Poverty Counties With High Participation In WIC

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| ALABAMA: Escambia Henry | MICHIGAN: Lake | OKLAHOMA: Atoka Greer Pushmataha Tillman |
| COLORADO: Otero Saguache | MISSISSIPPI: Benton Claiborne Clay Franklin Greene Grenada Jasper Jefferson Leake Montgomery Newton Noxubee Perry Tallahatchie Winston Yalobusha | SOUTH CAROLINA: Allendale Clarendon Fairfield McCormick Orangeburg |
| GEORGIA: Atkinson Bacon Baker Calhoun Charlton Clay Evans Hancock Irwin Miller Morgan Quitman Randolph Schley Stewart Talbot Taliaferro | MISSOURI: Carter Reynolds Stone Wayne Wright | SOUTH DAKOTA: Lyman |
| ILLINOIS: Alexander | NEW MEXICO: Union | TENNESSEE: Jackson Pickett |
| KENTUCKY: Estill Fleming Lee Martin Perry Robertson Wolfe | NORTH CAROLINA: Hertford Madison Pender Swain Tyrrell Yancey | TEXAS: Bailey Bee Dimmit Gonzales La Salle Mills San Saba Willacy Zapata Zavala |
| LOUISIANA: Caldwell East Carroll Evangeline Red River St. Helena Washington | NORTH DAKOTA: Rolette Slope | VIRGINIA: Accomack Franklin Portsmouth Surry Sussex |
| | OHIO: Pike | WEST VIRGINIA: Calhoun |

TABLE H-4
Child Poverty Counties With Low Participation in WIC

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| ARIZONA: Apache Navajo | NEBRASKA: Arthur Banner Blaine Greeley Hayes Logan | TENNESSEE: Shelby |
| ARKANSAS: Bradley Calhoun Jackson Lee Mississippi Polk Stone Woodruff | NEVADA: Eureka | TEXAS: Briscoe Collingsworth Concho Cottle Dickens Edwards Falls Hall Hardeman Haskell Houston Karnes Kenedy King Knox Leon Limestone Madison Mason McCulloch Medina Menard Mitchell Motley Real Red River Runnels San Augustine San Jacinto Swisher Uvalde Wilbarger |
| COLORADO: Conejos Costilla | NEW MEXICO: Dona Ana McKinley Socorro | |
| FLORIDA: Flagler Hamilton Highlands Suwannee | NORTH DAKOTA: Benson Dunn Grant Logan Sioux | |
| GEORGIA: Camden | OKLAHOMA: Delaware | |
| KENTUCKY: Lewis Washington | SOUTH DAKOTA: Buffalo Campbell Clark Corson Deuel Dewey Douglas Faulk Hamlin Hand Hanson Harding Hutchinson Jackson Kingsbury Marshall Mellette Shannon Todd Tripp Ziebach | |
| LOUISIANA: Orleans | | |
| MINNESOTA: Lincoln | | |
| MISSISSIPPI: Marshall | | |
| MONTANA: Blaine Carter Garfield Glacier Judith Basin Petroleum Prairie Treasure | | UTAH: San Juan |
| | | VIRGINIA: Norfolk Southampton |

330 (300)

108

APPENDIX I
Counties Served by the Commodity Supplemental Food Program (CSFP)
September 1984

| | Page |
|--|------|
| Table I-1—Counties Served by the Commodity Supplemental Food Program (CSFP): September 1984 | 303 |

(301)

301

TABLE I-1
Counties Served by the Commodity Supplemental Food Program (CSFP)
September 1984

| Region, State & County | Region, State & County |
|--|---|
| Mid-Atlantic Region Washington, D.C. | Mountain Plains Region Conejos Ct., CO Costilla Ct., CO Denver Ct., CO Mesa Ct., CO Rio Grande Ct., CO Weld, CO Polk, CO Central Nebraska (Sherman Ct.) Omaha, NE (Douglas Ct.) Walthill, NE (Thruston Ct.) Lincoln, NE (Lancaster Ct.) Mid-Nebraska (Buffalo) Nebraska Panhandle (Scotts Bluff Ct.) Fairbury, NE (Jefferson Ct.) Pine Ridge, SD (Shannon) |
| Southeast Region Louisville, KY (Bullitt Ct.) Halifax Ct., NC Dyer Ct., TN Map-South, TN (Shelby Ct.) Memphis-Shelby, TN (Shelby Ct.) Nashville, TN (Davidson Ct.) Weakly Ct., TN | |
| Midwest Region Chicago Catholic Charities, IL (Cook Ct.) Detroit, MI (Wayne Ct.) Redlake Ct., MN | |
| Southeast Region New Orleans, LA | Western Region San Francisco Ct., CA |

APPENDIX J
Sample Letters Requesting AFDC and WIC Data

SEVENTY-NINTH CONGRESS
 GEORGE MILLER, CALIFORNIA
 CHAIRMAN
 WILLIAM L. DINGELL, MICHIGAN
 PATRICK SCHWENKER, OREGON
 LARRY JONES, IDAHO
 ROBERT J. DODD, NEW YORK
 TONY DAVIS, NEW YORK
 RICHARD L. ROBERTS, ARIZONA
 BARBARA B. BOHRER, CALIFORNIA
 DANIEL A. ROBERTSON, CONNECTICUT
 J. ROY HODGINS, GEORGIA
 GERRY BROWN, MINNESOTA
 ALAN TINKER, MINNESOTA
 MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, CALIFORNIA
 LARRY DAVIS, ALABAMA
 ALAN J. STONE
 CLAY BROWN AND VERNON
 AND ROBERTSON
 STAFF CLERK
 TELEPHONE 226-7660

U.S. House of Representatives

SELECT COMMITTEE ON
 CHILDREN, YOUTH, AND FAMILIES
 355 HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING ANNEX 2
 WASHINGTON, DC 20515

DAVID CRUTE, GEORGIA
 CLAYTON D. JONES
 HAMILTON FORBES, JR., NEW YORK
 THOMAS J. BLAKEY, JR., VIRGINIA
 FRANK E. WOLFF, VIRGINIA
 ROBERT A. JOHNSON, CONNECTICUT
 JOHN E. VERDEMAN, JR., TEXAS
 BARBARA J. HALLGREN, NEBRASKA
 DAVID E. BROWN, UTAH
 ROBERT C. BOWEN, NEW HAMPSHIRE
 WILLIAM H. COOK, JR., NORTH CAROLINA
 MARK BOLAND
 STAFF CLERK
 TELEPHONE 226-7662

Dear :

As part of an ongoing assessment of the status of our nation's children, the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families is conducting a study of several federal programs which provide benefits to children. The intent of the study is to publish a report which provides a snapshot of every county in the United States with regard to the support available for low-income children in that county. The Committee believes this level of detail is needed to discern regional variation in children's rates of participation which might otherwise go unnoticed in studies conducted at the national level.

The study will focus on programs geared toward low-income children covering health, nutrition, education and income maintenance. Our intent is to determine in each county the number of children participating in each of the programs at a given (single) point in time. We have chosen March, 1984 (3/84), as the data anchor point because data for all programs appears to be available either for that month or for the school year in which that month falls.

As Chairman of the Select Committee, I request your assistance in preparing this analysis.

Please provide FOR EACH COUNTY WITHIN YOUR STATE data on the total number of AFDC cases, and the number of children in low-income families receiving AFDC benefits DURING MARCH, 1984. These data should include both AFDC and AFDC - U families. (Please indicate if AFDC - U families are included in the data and list separately if possible.)

So that the study can be completed and published as soon as possible, the Committee would appreciate receiving the data as soon as possible.

Thank you for your help in completing this important study. If you have questions or need for clarification, please contact the Select Committee staff, 202/226-7660.

Sincerely,

GEORGE MILLER
 Chairman
 Select Committee on Children,
 Youth, and Families

APPENDIX K

**Expenditures for Selected Programs in Current and Constant (1985)
Dollars**



Congressional Research Service
The Library of Congress

Washington, DC 20540

TABLE K-1
Expenditures for Selected Programs in Current and Constant (1985) Dollars
(millions)

| FY | | | AFPC | | Total | | WIC | | Head Start | |
|------|------------|---------|------------|---------|------------|---------|------------|---------|------------|---------|
| | Current \$ | 1985 \$ | Current \$ | 1985 \$ | Current \$ | 1985 \$ | Current \$ | 1985 \$ | Current \$ | 1985 \$ |
| 1970 | 2759.0 | 7789.8 | 1629.0 | 4599.4 | 4388.0 | 12389.2 | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| 1971 | 3279.0 | 8802.8 | 2723.0 | 7310.2 | 6002.0 | 16113.0 | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| 1972 | 3852.0 | 9980.4 | 3183.0 | 8247.0 | 7035.0 | 18227.4 | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| 1973 | 4178.0 | 10407.1 | 3434.0 | 8553.9 | 7612.0 | 18961.0 | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| 1974 | 4450.0 | 10174.2 | 3662.0 | 8372.5 | 8112.0 | 18546.7 | 10.4 | 23.8 | NA | NA |
| 1975 | 5177.0 | 10657.6 | 4316.0 | 8885.1 | 9493.0 | 19542.8 | 89.3 | 183.8 | 403.9 | 831.5 |
| 1976 | 5799.0 | 11146.1 | 4945.0 | 9504.6 | 10744.0 | 20650.7 | 142.6 | 274.1 | 441.0 | 847.6 |
| 1977 | 6221.0 | 11120.7 | 5345.0 | 9554.7 | 11566.0 | 20675.4 | 255.9 | 457.4 | 475.0 | 849.1 |
| 1978 | 6332.0 | 10573.5 | 5507.0 | 9195.8 | 11839.0 | 19769.3 | 379.6 | 633.9 | 625.0 | 1043.7 |
| 1979 | 6508.0 | 9850.3 | 5622.0 | 8509.3 | 12130.0 | 18359.5 | 525.4 | 795.2 | 680.0 | 1029.2 |
| 1980 | 7198.0 | 9592.3 | 6237.0 | 8311.7 | 13435.0 | 17904.0 | 707.9 | 943.4 | 735.0 | 979.5 |
| 1981 | 7763.0 | 9314.4 | 6731.0 | 8076.2 | 14494.0 | 17390.6 | 888.0 | 1065.5 | 818.7 | 982.3 |
| 1982 | 7800.0 | 8712.4 | 6812.0 | 7608.9 | 14612.0 | 16321.3 | 948.2 | 1059.1 | 911.7 | 1018.3 |
| 1983 | 8247.0 | 8899.0 | 7190.0 | 7758.4 | 15437.0 | 16657.4 | 1123.1 | 1211.9 | 912.0 | 984.1 |
| 1984 | 8583.0 | 8898.5 | 7486.0 | 7761.2 | 16069.0 | 16659.7 | 1386.3 | 1437.3 | 995.8 | 1032.4 |
| 1985 | 8964.0 | 8964.0 | 7803.0 | 7803.0 | 16767.0 | 16767.0 | 1491.9 | 1491.9 | 1075.1 | 1075.1 |

Note: Deflation of the current dollar expenditures was done using the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers published by the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

DISSENTING MINORITY VIEWS OF HON. DAN COATS, RANKING MINORITY MEMBER;
HON. THOMAS BLILEY, JR.; HON. FRANK WOLF; HON. BARBARA VUCANOVICH;
HON. DAVID MONSON; HON. ROBERT SMITH; AND HON. BILL COBEY

INTRODUCTION

The Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families has spent nearly a year comparing counties which are in most ways incomparable. In order to come to certain conclusions, it ignored the facts that didn't fit. And the result is this report, Safety Net Programs: Are They Reaching Poor Children?

Safety Net Programs attempts to compare the extent of child poverty in the nation's counties using only two criteria: 1) the percentage of children in each county who live below a certain national uniform income level, and 2) the percentage of those children who use federal programs, AFDC, WIC, and Headstart. No other criteria are considered. The actual population of the counties and the concentration of poverty within them are not considered. Variations in the cost of living are not considered. The true needs of the children in the counties are not considered.

And the findings?

-- Logan County, Nebraska, with 92 children in poverty, 10 children receiving AFDC, and 1.5% unemployment, is a "child poverty county." (See Table A.)

-- Cook County, Illinois (including Chicago), with 295,616

children in poverty, 351,017 children receiving AFDC and 7.9% unemployment is not a "child poverty county." (See Table B.)

- Garfield County, Montana, with 153 children in poverty, 5 children on AFDC, and 2.3% unemployment is a worse place for poor children than New York County, with 551,533 poor children, 531,846 children on AFDC and 8.2% unemployment. (See Tables A and B.)
- The real problem areas for children are not New York, Chicago, Detroit, Newark, or any other large city. The real problems are in small, midwestern towns and rural communities.
- The biggest problems are 31 small counties located in Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Texas, in which the average number of poor children is 263, the average unemployment is 4.9%, and the average number of children receiving AFDC is 20. (See Table A.)

Safety Net Programs reaches these astonishing conclusions through the use of a methodology which has been criticized by G.A.O. as seriously "doubtful." (See p.12, "Hunger Counties, Safety Net Programs, and the G.A.O.")

Part of a narrow push for a predetermined agenda, Safety Net Programs ignores most of the experience of the last few decades. In particular, it ignores the demographic changes which are responsible for the increases in child poverty. (See Part II, The Family and Economic Stability.) It also ignores the opposite changes in child poverty rates experienced by states with higher or lower AFDC payment standards. (See Part III, "Questions That Need Answers.")

By ignoring important facts and using faulty methodology Safety Net Programs disqualifies itself from serious consideration by those interested in improving our welfare programs. It is a personal disappointment to the many members of the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families who had hoped for a genuine contribution to the current discussion of welfare reform and families in poverty.

PART I

METHODOLOGICAL PROBLEMS

The principal finding of Safety Net Programs, according to its introduction, is that "record growth in poverty among children has not been accompanied by increased availability of key safety net programs." In particular, it argues, "support programs are not reaching the majority of those in need" and "are not most available where child poverty is greatest." In fact, Safety Net Programs finds nothing of the kind. For in all its 300-plus pages, it never locates 1) where child poverty is greatest, or 2) where programs are most needed.

Safety Net Programs is very similar to a January 1986 report by the Physician Task Force on Hunger in America. That report, Hunger Counties 1986 -- The Distribution of America's High-Risk Areas, was roundly criticized by the U.S. General Accounting Office in March 1986 for "methodological limitations that cast serious doubt on the accuracy of the estimated distribution of hunger by counties." Most of the methods criticized by G.A.O. in Hunger Counties 1986 are those employed by Safety Net Programs. A more detailed comparison of the methods used by the two reports will be presented at the end of Part I.

Independent of the G.A.O. analysis, we have six major objections to the methodology of Safety Net Programs. We believe that these six methodological problems prevent this report from assessing either the distribution of child poverty in the United States or whether programs are reaching those who need them most.

Assessing the Distribution of Child Poverty in the United States

Three Methodological Problems

1) Use of unequal entities as the unit of measurement.

If one is to measure the distribution of child poverty in the United States, it makes sense to find some unit of measurement small enough to determine the concentration of poverty within communities. But if that unit varies greatly in size and population, then the purpose of the endeavor is defeated. This is the case in Safety Net Programs. Child poverty is determined to be greatest in those counties with the highest percentage of children in poverty. But the population of the county is not taken into account. Therefore, Los Angeles County, because it has more children than many states have, taking in affluent and middle class suburbs as well as inner-city ghettos, is not determined to be a "child poverty county." But Arthur, Nebraska, with a population of 138 children total, is judged a "child poverty county." And this is determined regardless of the fact that Los Angeles County has 375,214 children in poverty while Arthur has 36.

Further, Safety Net Programs does not confine itself to comparing unequal counties; it also ranks states by the percentage of "child poverty counties" within them. As a result, states are treated disproportionately according to the size and population of their counties, not according to the actual number or percentage of children in poverty. For example, New York, with an actual child poverty rate of 19.0% is given only a 5% "child poverty county" rating, whereas Montana, North Dakota, North Carolina, and Texas all have actual child poverty rates less than 19.0%, but are judged far worse than New York on the basis of the percentage of "child poverty counties." Compared to New York's 5% rating, these states with lower percentages of

children in poverty are given "child poverty county" ratings of 16%, 24%, 28%, and 31% respectively.

Finally, as a means of judging the actual distribution of the numbers (rather than percentages) of poor children, the county-by-county ratings for states are even worse. For example, California, Indiana, Michigan, Pennsylvania, Ohio, New Jersey, Illinois, and New York together have only 12 poverty counties, but almost 4 million poor children. In contrast, South Dakota alone has 36 poverty counties, but only 40,552 poor children.

2) Lack of adjustment for cost-of-living from county to county or state to state.

The federal government allows states to set their own "need standard" for AFDC payment levels largely because the cost-of-living varies greatly from one state to another. Therefore, the AFDC need standard for a family of four in 1986 is \$698 in California, \$823 in Alaska, \$798 in the District of Columbia, and \$749 in Pennsylvania, while it is \$390 in Wyoming, \$341 in Nevada, \$450 in Kansas, and \$413 in Tennessee. New York and Michigan even have different need standards for different counties. Though it might be argued that particular states have placed their need standard too high or too low, one cannot reasonably argue that cost-of-living differences ought to be ignored altogether. Yet this is precisely what Safety Net Programs does. Nowhere is allowance made for the fact that housing in Indiana, Iowa, or Nebraska is less expensive than housing in California, Hawaii, or New York. Nor is any allowance made for differing income needs between large urban areas and small towns or rural communities. The absence of these considerations disproportionately weights the findings of this study against states and counties with lower costs-of-living.

3) Use of 1979 poverty data

Though Safety Net Programs measures program participation for 1984, it measures county-by-county poverty for 1979. Only national and regional poverty data are available for later years. The assumption is made that those counties with high child poverty rates in 1979 are most likely to have high child poverty rates in 1984. To a point, this assumption has merit. But the report does not adequately acknowledge its limitations. In Chapter III, the report speaks of the "failure of AFDC to meet increased need" in "child poverty counties." In doing so, it assumes not simply that the same counties are likely to be "child poverty counties" in 1984 as 1979, but also that these counties are likely to be the ones with increased poverty in 1984.

Assessing Whether Programs Reach Those Most in Need

Three Methodological Problems

1) Insensitivity to program eligibility requirements and goals other than those measured by income.

This report identifies poverty income with the need for all three programs; but the programs themselves do not. None of these programs is based on the assumption that all children in poverty will automatically need or be best served by that particular program.

WIC regulations require that a child be diagnosed as "nutritionally at risk" in order to be eligible for assistance. The purpose of the WIC program is to educate mothers about nutrition as well as to provide commodity assistance. It is not automatically assumed that poor mothers do not know what foods are good for their

children or are unable to supply them with those foods. Rather, WIC works on the assumption that low-income families with children who are nutritionally at risk will probably need assistance, both educational and in-kind, in order to bring their children back to good health.

AFDC eligibility varies from state to state. About half the states allow a child to receive AFDC only if the father is absent or disabled. The other half allow AFDC-UP payments to the child of an unemployed father, but these cases represent less than one-tenth of all recipients. In addition to an "income test," AFDC also imposes an "assets test" for program eligibility.

All children in poverty, 3-5 years of age, are technically eligible for Headstart, but enrollment for any individual child is limited to two years. Further, the purpose and goals of the program dictate that program directors distinguish between those most and least in need of the program. Headstart is a program intended to break the cycle of poverty by addressing the developmental needs of children born into that cycle. A low income, in itself, does not create developmental or educational deficiency. It is absurd to suppose that a child will automatically need the benefits of a Headstart program if his father is temporarily laid off or suffers a serious decrease in income. A recently released interim report of the National Assessment of Chapter 1 (Chapter 1 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act provides compensatory education for disadvantaged children) concluded that for individual pupils, "the families' poverty status is only weakly related to student achievement," but that the intensity of poverty a child experiences -- measured by the duration of time in poverty, or the local concentration of poor children -- is closely related to achievement.

Many states are concentrating on limiting most children to one year of participation in the program. That means that even if all eligible children are served by Headstart, only about a third of them will be served in any particular year, because children are technically eligible for three years.

2) Insensitivity to other resources available to children in poor families.

The three programs whose participation rates are measured in this report represent a small fraction of the public and private resources available to children in low income families. Private organizations such as Catholic Charities, Lutheran Social Services, Family Service America, and others perform major services for low-income families. Most state and local governments have their own programs, tailored to the needs of their own populations. Most states have General Assistance programs in addition to the federal programs available to low-income families.

The federal government alone has at least 70 programs having a direct impact on low-income children. These programs, listed and described in the Select Committee's 1984 report, Federal Programs Affecting Children, serve low-income families and their children through income maintenance (12 programs), nutrition assistance (9 programs), social services (19 programs), education and training (12 programs), health assistance (11 programs), housing assistance (4 programs), and tax relief (4 provisions). They include Food Stamps, Medicaid, Supplemental Security Income, Unemployment Compensation, National School Lunch Program, School Breakfast Program, Child Care Food Program, Summer Food Service, Commodity Assistance for Child Nutrition Programs, Special Milk Program, Commodity Supplemental Food

Program, Social Services Block Grant, Day Care Programs, Child Welfare Services, Federal Assistance to Refugees, Compensatory Education for Disadvantaged Children, Education Block Grant, Bilingual Education, Education for Migrant Children, Indian Education Programs, Education Programs for Refugee Children, Vocational Training, Job Training Partnership Act, Impact Aid, Maternal and Child Health Services Block Grant, Family Planning, Childhood Immunization, Preventative Health and Health Services Block Grant, Indian Health Programs, Migrant Health Program, Community Health Centers, Public Housing, Leased Housing Assistance, Home Ownership Assistance, Rental Housing Assistance, Earned Income Credit, and the Child Care Tax Credit.

It would indeed be difficult to assess the success of safety net programs in reaching those most in need without taking into account the impact of any of these programs. The above mentioned programs comprise a far larger portion of the federal safety net than the three programs measured.

3) Monthly and annual data combined in determining participation rates.

In determining participation levels for AFDC, Safety Net Programs uses annual income data, but monthly participation data. Because a family may be below poverty during any particular month (and therefore eligible for some programs), yet above the poverty level for the year altogether, the mixing of monthly and annual data results in serious inaccuracies in estimates of the actual participation rates for AFDC and for the distribution of participation from county to county. For example, 10 of Massachusetts' 14 counties are shown to have AFDC participation of over 100%. The District of Columbia has a 164% participation rate. Kent County, Delaware shows an AFDC participation rate of 299%!

Differences That Make a Difference

The failure of Safety Net Programs to recognize other resources available to children in low-income families, program eligibility requirements and goals, differences in cost-of-living, and differences in county size and population are representative of a general failure to recognize any differences between low-income populations and their needs. The report makes no distinction between long-term or short-term poor, between the employed or unemployed, between the single-parent or two-parent family, between the child of a farmer experiencing a bad year and the child of a 16-year old single mother, between a child in a midwest small town or a child in an inner city slum. By failing to make these distinctions, this report tends to find more poverty in small towns than in big cities, and to judge poor children worse off in small towns and farming communities than in inner-city neighborhoods.

Table A takes those counties listed in Table E-13 of Safety Net Programs as "child poverty counties with low participation in AFDC, Headstart, and WIC," and adds additional data on the numbers of children in each county who are poor and who are receiving AFDC, and the unemployment rate for that county. These counties would be what the report describes as 1) "where child poverty is greatest" and 2) where "support programs are not reaching the majority of those in need." These, the report implies, are where child poverty and its consequences are at their worst.

In contrast, Table B lists six large counties which one might expect to see on a list of the worst child poverty counties in the United States. But as defined by this report, only three of these counties, New York County, Philadelphia County, and Essex County

TABLE A
Child Poverty Counties With Low Participation
In AFDC, Headstart, and WIC

| | Number of children in poverty - 1979 | Unemployment Rates* | Number of children on AFDC | |
|----------------------|---|------------------------|-------------------------------|-------|
| | | | 1979 | 1984 |
| MONTANA: | | | | |
| Carter | 166 | 2.9 | 7 | 4 |
| Garfield | 153 | 2.3 | 5 | 4 |
| Judith Basin | 210 | 3.3 | 21 | 5 |
| Petroleum | 93 | 9.0 | 5 | 2 |
| Prairie | 208 | 4.0 | 3 | 7 |
| Treasure | 77 | 3.1 | 10 | 2 |
| NEBRASKA: | | | | |
| Arthur | 36 | 1.0 | 0 | 0 |
| Banner | 81 | 2.1 | 9 | 6 |
| Blaine | 91 | 5.4 | 11 | 10 |
| Hayes | 101 | 3.9 | 2 | 3 |
| Logan | 92 | 1.5 | 10 | 12 |
| NEVADA: | | | | |
| Eureka | 123 | 4.6 | 2 | 2 |
| NORTH DAKOTA: | | | | |
| Logan | 302 | 2.6 | 18 | 15 |
| SOUTH DAKOTA: | | | | |
| Campbell | 227 | 2.8 | 4 | 3 |
| Clark | 460 | 3.5 | 24 | 14 |
| Deuel | 418 | 5.9 | 25 | 17 |
| Hamlin | 496 | 3.8 | 31 | 21 |
| Hanson | 493 | 2.1 | 21 | 10 |
| Harding | 153 | 0.9 | 4 | 3 |
| Jackson | 574 | 4.5 | 190 | 17 |
| TEXAS: | | | | |
| Briscoe | 273 | 7.0 | 36 | 26 |
| Collingworth | 459 | 6.6 | 56 | 36 |
| Concho | 220 | 7.0 | 18 | 19 |
| Edwards | 343 | 8.9 | 50 | 50 |
| Haskell | 554 | 7.1 | 138 | 83 |
| Kenedy | 58 | 4.7 | 4 | 3 |
| King | 40 | 6.3 | 0 | 3 |
| Knox | 438 | 8.3 | 133 | 102 |
| Menard | 217 | 10.1 | 16 | 31 |
| Mitchell | 796 | 15.3 | 107 | 97 |
| Motley | 213 | 1.9 | 15 | 14 |
| Average | 263.39 | 4.91 | 31.45 | 20.03 |

*Department of Labor figures for June, 1986.

TABLE B
Samples of U.S. Counties Without Low Participation
In AFDC, Headstart, and WIC

| <u>Non-poverty Counties</u> | <u>Number of children in poverty - 1979</u> | <u>Unemployment Rate 1986*</u> | <u>Number of children on AFDC</u> | |
|-----------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------|
| <u>ILLINOIS:</u> | | | 1979 | 1984 |
| Cook | 295,616 | 7.5** | 351,017 | 333,030 |
| <u>CALIFORNIA:</u> | | | | |
| Los Angeles | 375,214 | 6.7 | 367,628 | 395,459 |
| <u>MICHIGAN:</u> | | | | |
| Wayne | <u>138,682</u> | <u>8.7</u> | <u>188,941</u> | <u>209,163</u> |
| Average | 269,837 | 7.6 | 302,529 | 312,551 |
| <u>Child Poverty Counties</u> | | | | |
| <u>NEW YORK:</u> | | | | |
| New York | 551,533 | 8.2 | 531,846 | 497,278 |
| <u>PENNSYLVANIA:</u> | | | | |
| Philadelphia | 128,540 | 6.7 | 176,490 | 147,673 |
| <u>NEW JERSEY:</u> | | | | |
| Essex | <u>66,883</u> | <u>6.3</u> | <u>82,859</u> | <u>70,670</u> |
| Average | 248,985 | 7.06 | 263,732 | 238,540 |

*Department of Labor figures for June, 1986.

**Department of Labor figures for July, 1986.

(Newark, NJ), are "child poverty counties." The other three, Cook County (Chicago, IL), Los Angeles County, and Wayne County (Detroit, MI), are not considered "child poverty counties."

The contrast between the "child poverty, low participation" counties in Table A and the "non-poverty, high/moderate participation" counties in Table B is striking. The "child poverty counties" in Table A average 263 poor children per county. But the "non-poverty counties" in Table B average over 269 thousand poor children per county. The unemployment rates in these "child poverty counties" average 4.9%, well below the national average of 6.9%, while the unemployment rates for the non-poverty counties average 7.6%.

AFDC participation levels differ dramatically between the large and small counties as well. Participation levels for the six large counties average well over 100%, while participation levels for the small child poverty counties of Table A average under 15%. AFDC participation levels in these small counties are so dramatically low that they come close to being non-existent. Their contrast to the larger counties seems not simply a difference of degree, but a difference of kind.

Safety Net Programs explains that low participation on AFDC is caused largely by low payment standards. But the differences between participation rates for the counties in Table A and the counties in Table B cannot be explained so simply. The states in Table A tend to have average and above-average payment standards, but below-average AFDC participation levels. With the exception of Texas, each state in Table A has a significantly higher rating for payment standard than it has for program participation. But in Table B, most states (California and New York excepted) have higher ratings for participation than for

payment standard. Illinois, for example, ranks 8th in the nation for its AFDC participation, but only 27th for its AFDC payment standard. (See Table 1'I-10 Safety Net Programs, p.61.)

The differences between the low participation counties of Table A and the high participation counties of Table B indicate deeper, more fundamental differences in the populations studied. But these differences are ignored in Safety Net Programs. We will examine them further in Part II of our Dissenting Views.

"Hunger Counties 1986," "Safety Net Programs " and the G.A.O.

In its March 1986 report on Hunger Counties 1986, the Government Accounting Office listed nine methodological limitations which it considered to seriously affect the accuracy of the study's findings concerning the distribution of hunger in America. We have listed those limitations in Table C along with an indication of whether the G.A.O. found each limitation to be a major or minor problem and with a note indicating how this same methodology was used in the Safety Net Program study.

TABLE C
Comparison of Methodological Limitations
in Hunger Counties 1986 and Safety Net Programs

| GAO FINDINGS | | |
|--|------------------|--|
| <u>Limitation</u> <u>Hunger Counties 1986</u> | <u>Magnitude</u> | <u>Limitation</u> <u>Safety Net Programs</u> |
| Use of 1979 data for poverty indicator | Minor | Same-Use of 1979 data for poverty indicator. |
| Insensitivity to numbers of food stamps non-participants. | Major | Same-Use of absolute counties participation rates rather than absolute numbers. |
| Use of participation data for one month rather than one year. | Minor | Same-Participation in WIC and AFDC were based on one month participation. |
| Insensitivity to assets test for food stamps | Major | Same-No consideration of assets test for AFDC or any other eligibility requirement for AFDC, WIC, and Headstart. |
| Use of regional averages to update number of persons eligible for food stamps. | Major | Similar-Regional averages used in place of county data for determining WIC participation. |
| Monthly and annual data combined in participation indicator. | Major | Same-Monthly and annual data combined in participation indicator for AFDC. |
| Sampling error in estimating number of persons eligible for food stamps. | Minor | Same-Both studies draw from Census Bureau county estimates of persons living below poverty |
| Inattention to low participation rates in low poverty counties. | Major | Similar-Report emphasizes "child poverty counties" as places where programs are most needed. |
| Indirect measurement of hunger. | Major | Similar-Indirect measurement of need for programs through exclusive use of poverty data. |

Inattention to low participation rates in low poverty counties.

Major

Similar-Report emphasizes "child poverty counties" as places where programs are most needed.

Indirect measurement of hunger.

Major

Similar-Indirect measurement of need for programs through exclusive use of poverty data.

PART II

THE FAMILY AND ECONOMIC STABILITYDemographic Trends: The Impact on Child Poverty and Welfare Dependency

By focusing exclusively on the five-year period between 1979 and 1984, Safety Net Programs narrows its scope to include only the economic effects of the period of inflation and recession of the late 70's and early 80's. Since then, inflation has dropped dramatically, and the effects of the recession on child poverty, which reached their peak in 1983, have decreased every year since. But even though these short-term effects are history, the United States is still living with the long-term, disastrous effects of the demographic changes of the past several decades.

By ignoring all that occurred before 1979, Safety Net Programs ignores two of the most important economic and demographic developments affecting child poverty in this century:

- 1) between 1960 and 1985, poverty among children in two-parent families decreased almost by half;
- 2) during that same period the percentage of children living in female-headed families more than doubled.

Though the single-parent family has benefited from the same economic trends that helped the two-parent family, it has not benefited to the same extent. Poverty among children in female-headed families decreased almost 25%, from 72.2% in 1959 to 54.0% in 1984, but it still remained more than four times greater than poverty among children in

families in which the father was present, 12.5% in 1984. Though children in single-parent families now make up about one-fifth of all children, they account for over one-half of all children in poverty. In 1960, when children of single-parent families made up about one-tenth of all children, they accounted for about one-fourth of all children in poverty.

The poverty status of single-parent families differs considerably according to the sex and marital status of the parent. Single fathers have poverty rates close to those of two-parent families, but they make up only about one-tenth of all single-parent families. Among single mothers, those who have never married have by far the highest poverty rate, 69% in 1983. Divorced and separated mothers have the next highest poverty rate, 44.1%; and widowed mothers have the lowest poverty rate, 34.1%.

Over the past 25 years, children of widowed mothers have decreased as a percentage of all poor children, while children of divorced, separated or never-married mothers have increased. In 1983, children of never-married mothers accounted for 26% of children of single mothers in poverty; children of divorced or separated mothers account for 64%; and the children of widows account for 10%. It should be noted that the percentage of children of never-married mothers is not the same thing as the percentage of children born out-of-wedlock. Children born out-of-wedlock may be born before the mother married or after she was divorced or separated from her husband. It is very likely that the percentage of poor children born out-of-wedlock is seriously underestimated by considering only children of never-married mothers.

According to a 1983 report by the Select Committee, U.S. Children

and Their Families, out-of-wedlock births as a percentage of all births increased more than 450% in 30 years. For all races, the percent of children born out of wedlock increased from 4.0% in 1950 to 18.4% in 1980. For whites, the increase in out-of-wedlock births was from 1.7% in 1950 to 10.0% in 1980. For non-whites, the increase was from 16.8% to 48.5%. For blacks, out-of-wedlock births accounted for 55.3% of all births in 1980. In 1986, the out-of-wedlock birthrate among blacks now approaches 60% for the population generally, and surpasses 80% in some inner-city neighborhoods.

The poverty status of the children of never-married mothers does not seem to vary significantly between blacks and whites. According to a 1985 Ways and Means report, Children in Poverty, the "never-married" status of a mother has a more consistent effect on poverty status of her children than any other characteristic. The child of a never-married mother spends, on the average, 6 years in poverty if she is black, and 6.2 years if she is not black.

The relationship between marital status and welfare dependency is a strong one. According to a March 3, 1986 Ways and Means report on programs within the committee's jurisdiction, the percentage of AFDC families in which the father was never married to the mother increased from 27.9% in 1969 to 48.1% in 1983.

Once on welfare, young never-married mothers are very likely to remain on welfare for long periods of time. According to studies by David T. Ellwood and Mary Jo Bane of Harvard University, "a majority of people who have ever been on welfare have been on the rolls for a short time, less than five years. But a majority of the people on the rolls at any point in time are in the midst of long spells" of welfare dependence.

A recent study prepared for the Working Seminar on the Family and American Welfare Policy in conjunction with the Institute for Family Studies at Marquette University expands upon the work of Ellwood and Bane. Entitled, According to Age: Longitudinal Profiles of AFDC Recipients and the Poor by Age Group, the study uses the PSID (Panel Study of Income Dynamics) data to refine the distinction between short-term and long-term welfare recipients. Its findings indicate that older women who become eligible for AFDC after the breakup of a marriage are recipients for much shorter periods of time than younger women who became eligible while still unmarried. Among women who first receive benefits when they are 40 or older, 50 percent are no longer receiving benefits within two years. In contrast, women who first received AFDC benefits when they were less than 25 years old remained dependent on AFDC for a far longer time. Seventy percent received AFDC for at least five years, and more than one-third remained dependent on the program for at least 10 years. Charles Murray, author of the study, summarized its findings, saying that "for older and previously married women," welfare "tends to be a benign source of help." But "for the younger and never married, it tends to deform the marriage and labor-market behaviors that would otherwise enable them to achieve a productive adulthood." Teenagers and women in their early 20's who have babies out of wedlock "do not get married as often as their peers, do not remarry as quickly, and do not get into the labor market with the same kind of success."

Low Income and the Culture of Poverty

Safety Net Programs ignores the relationship between the breakdown of the family and the increase of poverty among children. It demonstrates a remarkable lack of interest in the real causes of

poverty among children today. Safety Net Programs has confused two very different things: 1) poverty, which is low income, and 2) the culture of poverty. Poverty in this country is increasingly part of a culture of poverty, but Safety Net Programs does not acknowledge the difference.

The culture of poverty is marked by all of the forms of family breakdown discussed above: divorce, separation, and especially, out-of-wedlock births. In its most devastating form this breakdown of the family is a result, not of family break-up, but of the failure of families to form completely, with both a mother and a father. Unmarried mothers are younger and younger, and births to unmarried teens are growing faster than those to any other group. The result is not only poverty and dependence for young mothers and their children, but for the next generation as well. Raised in an environment in which fathers don't provide for their young and dependence on government is assumed, few children will develop the skills of self-sufficiency, or even the concept of personal responsibility. Young men will not strive to be good providers and young women will not expect it of their men. Family breakdown becomes cyclical, out-of-wedlock births become cyclical, poverty and dependence become cyclical. And the culture of poverty grows.

For the last 20 years, the culture of poverty in America has rarely been spoken of. In 1962, Michael Harrington, author of The Other America and early promoter of the War on Poverty was among the first to mention this "other culture in America" in 1962. "The most important analytic point," he wrote, "is the fact that poverty in America forms a culture, a way of life and feeling, that makes it a whole." He wrote about the breakdown of family life in the ghetto, the disastrous increase in the number of female-headed families, and in the

growing trend of out-of-wedlock births. He described this new culture as different from the poverty of poor ethnic immigrants, lacking its hope and ambition to become part of mainstream America. But since 1965, when Daniel Patrick Moynihan issued his report on the breakdown of the black family, discussion of the subject has been closed.

In the last year, beginning with Bill Moyers' CBS report on "The Vanishing Family," discussion of the relationship between family and poverty has reopened. Washington Post reporter Leon Dash's series on teen pregnancy in the District of Columbia came fast on the heels of the Moyers report. Then in quick succession came Nicholas Lemann's two part series "The Origin's of the Underclass," and Mickey Kaus' article, on "The Work Ethic State" and the culture of poverty. One common theme runs through all these discussions: the breakdown of the family has caused the growth of a culture of poverty and dependence, a "permanent underclass" as Lemann and Kaus call it.

One of the primary results of this new discussion is the realization that the current array of "safety net" programs is not holding back the tide of poverty; on the contrary, many argue that these programs are partially responsible for the growth of poverty in the United States. They suggest the alteration or replacement of current safety net programs in order to help those caught in the culture of poverty make their way out. Further discussion of these arguments will be presented in Part III of our Dissenting Views.

Safety Net Programs and the Future of Poor Children

At this point it is reasonable to ask, "What contribution does Safety Net Programs make to the discussion of the future of the programs designed to help children in poverty?" The answer is,

"None." Safety Net Programs is totally irrelevant to that discussion because it does not acknowledge the questions which brought it into being. Safety Net Programs ignores the effect of family disintegration on poverty. It stands alone in its ignorance of any difference between the temporary poverty of a stable family suffering an economic setback and the longterm dependence of a 16-year old unmarried mother and her child. It is ridiculous in its implication that poverty among children is more devastating in Prairie, Montana, or Arthur, Nebraska, or Eureka, Nevada than it is in Harlem, or Watts, or Chicago's West Side. As long as reports such as Safety Net Programs continue to ignore the fundamental relationship between the family and economic stability, they will continue to be irrelevant to the discussion of how to help poor children and their families.

PART III.

QUESTIONS THAT NEED ANSWERS

In order to make any worthwhile contribution to the national debate over welfare reform and families in poverty, we must include certain considerations in our deliberation. The following questions present themselves immediately:

- How much do differences in county child poverty rates reflect differences in cost of living among counties?
- Why do many children whose income makes them eligible for AFDC not receive it?
- To what extent do AFDC payment standards affect participation rates in AFDC?
- What causes the dramatic variations in the AFDC participation of poor children within a single state?
- To what extent do AFDC payment standards affect the percentage of children who are in poverty?
- How do developmental and educational levels of poor children in rural counties compare to those of poor children in inner city neighborhoods?
- How do family attitudes about economic status, work and dependence, affect participation in "safety net programs?"
How do these attitudes affect the ability of families to cope

with the deprivations of low income?

- How do high payment standards affect attitudes about work?
How do they affect attitudes about family formation?
- How do family composition and family attitudes affect
children's needs for special nutritional and educational
programs?
- How do family composition and attitudes of the rural poor
compare to those of the inner-city poor?

Only one of these questions (that concerning the relationship between AFDC payment standards and participation rates) was treated by Safety Net Programs, but they are all important to its findings. They do not require answers of pin-point accuracy, but they do deserve consideration and the most specific answers of which we are capable. Even if their answers are unknown to us now, we cannot ignore the questions. Unless we have good reason to believe that the answer, if known, would make little difference to our conclusion, we must at least recognize the existence of an unknown variable.

Safety Net Programs does not consider these questions. Instead, it rests on two basic assumptions which bypass these questions altogether:

- 1) All children living under a certain national income standard are alike in their need for WIC, Headstart, and AFDC.
- 2) The effects of these three programs will be the same for all children of poor families. There are no unintended or harmful

effects which should concern state or federal policy-makers.

Objections to the first assumption are evident from the discussion of methodology in Part I. The second assumption, though less obviously so, is also quite controversial.

In particular, we refer not to WIC or Headstart, but to AFDC. The debate over the longterm effects of AFDC on poverty and dependence is too well-known to be simply ignored. Currently, we are in the midst of a nationwide experimentation on a variety of proposals to decrease work disincentives that seem to be built into the AFDC program. If there were no widespread perception of the negative effects of AFDC on work and family formation, there would not now be a national debate on work requirements and welfare reform. It is inexcusable for Safety Net Programs to ignore that debate or the possibility that some federal "safety net programs" may have unintended consequences. By doing so, it disqualifies itself from making any useful contribution to public policy.

Some Unintended Effects of Safety Net Programs

The 1985 Ways and Means report on Children in Poverty cites a study by Sheldon Danziger and Robert Plotnick which gives "the only sophisticated estimates available on the effect of increased cash transfers from 1967 to 1974 on the poverty rate after accounting for disincentive effects." In both years studied, cash transfers decreased "market income" among those receiving transfers, and therefore increased the "market income poverty rate." In 1967, when cash transfers totalled \$12.6 billion*, the market income poverty rate was

*1983 dollars

5% higher than what it would have been in the absence of cash transfers. In 1974, when transfers totalled \$26.6 billion*, the market income poverty rate was 12% higher than it would have been in the absence of transfers. As a result, after taking into account both the poverty-decreasing effects of the cash transfers and the poverty-increasing effects of the work disincentives caused by those transfers, estimates show that cash transfers decreased poverty rates by 0.7% in 1967 and 1.0% in 1974.

A forthcoming report of the Joint Economic Committee, Poverty, Income Distribution, The Family and Public Policy, expands upon the findings of Danziger and Plotnick and posits the existence of a "poverty-welfare curve." According to the estimates cited by the Ways and Means report, \$12.6 billion in 1967 decreased the poverty rate by 0.7%, or 0.056% per \$1 billion, but an additional \$14.0 billion in 1974 decreased the poverty rate by only 0.3%, or 0.021% per \$1 billion. It seems that additional cash transfers become less effective in reducing poverty because of the increased work disincentives which go with them. If so, then there may be a point at which the poverty-increasing effects of work disincentives "outweigh" the poverty decreasing effects of the cash transfers. In such an event, argues the Joint Economic Committee study, additional cash transfers could actually increase poverty. The study substantiates this theory through the use of regression analysis, finding statistically significant relationships between cash transfers beyond a certain level and increases in poverty.

Dealing specifically with the issue of children in poverty, the J.E.C. study raises more interesting questions. After controlling for differences on the rate of real economic growth, the study found a

*1983 dollars

strong statistical relationship between the level of AFDC payments, by state, and the percentage change in the child poverty rate. The study found that those states with higher benefit levels tended to have increases in the rates of child poverty while states with lower benefit levels had decreases in child poverty rates.

Table D and E compare the changes in state child poverty rates of those 15 states with the highest AFDC payment standards and those 15 states with the lowest AFDC payment standards. Change was measured between the last two decennial censuses, 1969 and 1979. All but one state with high payment standards saw an increase in child poverty rates during that period. In contrast, all of the low-payment states experienced declines in child poverty rates. The average change among high-payment states was a 24% increase; the average change among low-payment states was a 16.8% decrease.

According to the Joint Economic Committee study, these different trends in child poverty between high-payment and low-payment states cannot be explained by differing economic conditions. After controlling for differences in economic growth, the positive relationship between AFDC payment levels and changes in child poverty rates remain strong.

Authors of the study obtained similar results from examination of county AFDC and child poverty data after controlling for differences in income and unemployment. These new findings, discovered through analysis of county data contained in Safety Net Programs, is explained in the Appendix to these Dissenting Views. (See Appendix, "The Impact of the Availability of AFDC Payments on Poverty Among Children," by Lowell Gallaway and Richard Vedder.)

COMPARING JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE FINDINGS ON STATE CHILD
POVERTY RATES TO SELECT COMMITTEE FINDINGS ON STATE PAYMENT STANDARDS

TABLE D
Percentage Change In Poverty Rate, 1969-1979, In States
With The Highest AFDC Payment Standards

| Rank | State* | 1979 Payment Standard For a 4 Person Family** | % Change In Poverty Rate*** |
|------|---------------|--|--------------------------------|
| 1 | Vermont | \$524 | +20.9 |
| 2 | California | \$487 | +19.7 |
| 3 | Washington | \$483 | +17.3 |
| 4 | New York | \$476 | +49.6 |
| 5 | Michigan | \$470 | +41.5 |
| 6 | Wisconsin | \$458 | +16.9 |
| 7 | Minnesota | \$454 | +07.3 |
| 8 | Connecticut | \$446 | +46.2 |
| 9 | Iowa | \$419 | +13.9 |
| 10 | New Hampshire | \$392 | +19.0 |
| 11 | North Dakota | \$389 | -10.1 |
| 11 | Utah | \$389 | +00.9 |
| 11 | Rhode Island | \$389 | +16.2 |
| 14 | New Jersey | \$386 | +53.2 |
| 15 | Massachusetts | \$379 | +48.9 |

TABLE E
Percentage Change In Poverty Rate, 1969-1979, In 15 States
With The Lowest AFDC Payment Standards

| Rank | State* | 1979 Payment Standard For a 4 Person Family** | % Change In Poverty Rate*** |
|------|----------------|--|--------------------------------|
| 1 | Texas | \$140 | -13.8 |
| 2 | Tennessee | \$148 | -16.3 |
| 2 | Alabama | \$148 | -19.5 |
| 4 | Georgia | \$170 | -12.4 |
| 5 | Louisiana | \$187 | -21.7 |
| 6 | Arkansas | \$188 | -25.2 |
| 7 | North Carolina | \$210 | -22.5 |
| 8 | South Carolina | \$229 | -26.8 |
| 9 | Florida | \$230 | -03.6 |
| 10 | Kentucky | \$235 | -13.3 |
| 11 | Arizona | \$239 | -07.8 |
| 12 | New Mexico | \$242 | -17.2 |
| 13 | West Virginia | \$249 | -23.9 |
| 14 | Mississippi | \$252 | -26.4 |
| 15 | Missouri | \$270 | -02.0 |

* Hawaii and Alaska not included because of extremely high cost-of-living.

** From Safety Net Programs, Table III-10

*** From Poverty, Income Distribution, The Family and Public Policy, Table 7-3. Joint Economic Committee.

Conclusion

We do not regard anything written in these Dissenting Views as pointing the way toward any one particular solution to the problem of child poverty in America. Indeed, Minority Members represent a wide diversity of opinion about the solutions to this problem. Rather, we are unified simply in our desire to see a better and more complete treatment of the most important subject our Committee has ever treated.

We have posed questions which we believe are important to this discussion, not because we think we know all the answers, but because we know that the solution to child poverty in America will depend upon our finding the answers to these questions. Nor do we believe that these are the only important questions to be asked. There may be some we have missed. But we do know that these questions, ignored in Safety Net Programs, are essential to this discussion.

We had hoped that the Select Committee would help Congress answer some of these questions and find a more complete solution to the problem of children in poverty. We still hope that it will. However, we no longer look for that help to come from this report. Safety Net Programs is not a serious examination of child poverty in the United States. It seems never to have sought a solution to a problem; it started with a solution and sought only that evidence which would support it. In order to achieve even that very limited goal, it had to ignore gaping holes in the evidence.

We are saddened that this document should ever come forth from the Select Committee, for we believe that it injures the credibility of a body which should have made great contributions to the debate on

welfare reform. If it is still not too late to make those contributions, we are ready to start all over again and work together to that end.

Dan Coats, Ranking Minority Member

Thomas J. Bliley, Jr.

Frank R. Wolf

Barbara Vucanovich

David S. Monson

Robert C. Smith

Bill Cobey

344

APPENDIX

344

340

345

THE IMPACT OF THE AVAILABILITY OF AFDC PAYMENTS
ON POVERTY AMONG CHILDREN

by

Lowell Gallaway

and

Richard Vedder

Ohio University

Athens, Ohio

345

341

THE IMPACT AND AVAILABILITY OF AFDC PAYMENTS
ON POVERTY AMONG CHILDREN

One of the major programs designed to alleviate poverty among the American population is Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC). The particular focus of this dimension of public policy is on improving the economic status of children, a group that may be unwitting victims of the economic circumstances of their parent(s).

The rationale of the AFDC program is a simple one. Payments under it are intended to enhance household income. In some cases the enhancement effects might even be sufficient to shift a household's income level from below the poverty threshold. That this could happen in a significant number of instances is indicated by the county by county AFDC participation rates calculated for purposes of the Committee report. In 1979, 125 counties provided AFDC payments to a greater number of children than those recorded as living in households with income below the poverty threshold. This obviously indicates that income supplements through AFDC are often available to households with incomes near the poverty threshold. What this suggests is that greater availability of AFDC payments to children has the potential of reducing the observed poverty rate among this portion of the American population.

At the other extreme, where AFDC payments are available to only a small fraction of poor children, as low as zero percent in some cases, it would be expected that the relative lack of AFDC payments for children would leave the incidence of child poverty virtually unchanged. Extended across the full range of the observed experience across the United States, the income enhancing effects of AFDC on household income should produce a negative relationship

between their relative availability and child poverty.

This surely would be the case if the only impact of AFDC payments were the income enhancing one. However, there is a large body of empirical evidence which indicates that income transfers of the AFDC type generate labor market disincentives which have the effect of reducing household income.⁽¹⁾ What this means is that the income enhancing effects of AFDC payments on household income are merely one part of an overall picture that is much more complex than the simple notion that more AFDC stipends obviously will produce reductions in child poverty. It is quite possible that the labor market disincentive dimension of AFDC income will more than cancel out the income enhancing effect, leaving less money income for some households, rather than more. Conceivably, this phenomenon could be strong enough to produce a positive relationship between the availability of AFDC income and the incidence of child poverty. Whether this is the case can only be determined by an examination of the available data.

The Empirical Evidence

The materials prepared for the Committee report are quite useful from the standpoint of determining the relative importance of the income enhancing and disincentive effects of the relative availability of AFDC payments for children. Especially helpful are the data compiled from the 1980 decennial census which describe the AFDC participation rate, defined as the number of children receiving AFDC payments as a percent of all poor children, and the child poverty rate. We have employed this information to conduct an analysis of the relationship between child poverty and AFDC participation for 3,098 counties and independent cities in the United

States.

Of course, AFDC participation is not the sole determinant of variations in the rate of child poverty in these areas. General economic conditions, as well as unique regional factors, also have an effect on levels of child poverty. In particular, it would be expected that differences in general economic conditions would be an important factor in accounting for county to county differences in the volume of poverty. Accordingly, we compiled information from standard sources describing the per capita level of income and unemployment rate for each of the 3,098 jurisdictions for which the AFDC participation and child poverty rate figures are available.(2)

Using these data, we conducted a multivariate analysis of the determinants of the child poverty rate in the United States.(3) Initially, we expected to find a negative relationship between child poverty and the level of per capita income and a positive link between unemployment and the magnitude of child poverty. The income-poverty connection is very powerful in the anticipated direction. However, unemployment is only weakly related to the level of child poverty and, somewhat unexpectedly, in a negative fashion. Therefore, we excluded it from the analysis. What about the impact of AFDC participation on child poverty? The analysis reveals a highly significant link. Most interesting is its direction. Higher levels of AFDC participation by jurisdiction are systematically associated with higher child poverty rates.(4) While the effect is quantitatively small, nevertheless it is a statistically significant one. The empirical results are summarized in Table 1.

TABLE 1

Results of Analysis of Factors Influencing Child Poverty Rate,
3,098 Counties and Independent Cities, United States, 1979

| Source of Effect on Child Poverty Rate | Magnitude of Effect | t-Statistic Associated with Effect |
|---|------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| One Percentage Point Change in AFDC Participation Rate | 0.0201 | 4.08 |
| One Dollar Change in Per Capita Income | -0.0047 | 42.54 |
| Being a Southern Jurisdiction* | 5.5606 | 10.44 |
| Being a Midwestern Jurisdiction* | 0.2812 | 0.53 |
| Being a Western Jurisdiction* | 2.5554 | 4.35 |

Source: Author's calculations.

*Increase in child poverty rate relative to Eastern jurisdictions.

Conclusions

What conclusions may be drawn from these findings? Apparently the labor market disincentive effects that accompany the provision of transfer payment income to households are sufficiently strong to overwhelm the income enhancement provided by AFDC. Consequently, contrary to the intent of the designers of the AFDC approach to dealing with the economic environment faced by dependent children in the United States, a greater availability of AFDC payments to a population has the effect of increasing the child poverty rate, instead of decreasing it. This empirical result suggests that the parameters affecting the outcomes of public policy with respect to the economic status of children are quite a bit more complex than commonly assumed.

FOOTNOTES

1. The pertinent literature is summarized in our Poverty, Income Distribution, the Family and Public Policy, Joint Economic Committee of Congress (Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1986).
2. The basic data source is U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, County and City Data Book, 10th edition (Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1983).
3. The statistical technique employed is least squares regression analysis. The child poverty rate is the dependent variable and the independent variables are the 1979 level of per capita income, the unemployment rate recorded in the 1980 decennial census, the AFDC participation rate contained in the Committee report, and a series of "dummy" variables designed to measure any unique regional effects (other than income and unemployment levels) on the child poverty rate. Separate variables were constructed for the following regions: (1) the Southern (defined as the South Atlantic, East South Central, and West South Central Census areas), (2) the Midwestern (defined as the East North Central and West North Central portion of the country), and (3) the Western (comprising the Rocky Mountain and Pacific States). These variables measure the general difference in poverty in these areas relative to the Eastern (New England and Middle Atlantic) portion of the country.
4. This finding is quite consistent with a number of other analyses of these relationship that we have conducted. These involve the use of both time series and cross-section data for the entire population and a number of demographic sub-groups, including children. This work is summarized in our Poverty, Income Distribution, the Family and Public Policy, *op. cit.*

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

Additional Dissenting Minority Views

Safety Net Programs: Are They Reaching Poor Children?
 is not an effective use of the resources of the Select
 Committee for Children, Youth and Families.

The Select Committee for Children, Youth and Families was established because Congress recognized that we lacked effective policies to look after the needs of children and families. Congress mandated the Committee, through vigorous oversight, to develop policies to improve the programs that would meet those needs. With the release of this study, the Committee will once again fail its mandate.

The statistical foundation of the study has drawn strong and valid criticism. Its conclusion, that many children are not served by programs we have established to meet their needs, should surprise no one.

Until the Committee delves into the causes of family poverty and evaluates the weaknesses of current programs more rigorously, we in Congress will not be able to provide the leadership to address real shortfalls in assistance and real problems in the lives of poor children and families.

The Minority raises two worthy points in its dissent. The weaknesses within our poverty programs cannot be addressed without confronting the rise in single parent families headed by women and the corresponding rise in poverty among children. We cannot ignore evidence that our current system may encourage dependence as well as provide support.

Nevertheless, these are only two of a complicated array of factors that must be examined if we truly are to help children and their families out of poverty.

During the past two years, this Committee has released a number of studies. As the 99th Congress comes to a close, we want to register our dissent to the Chairman's decision to fund studies rather than genuine oversight to produce programmatic change. We know there is a need. Let us work together to address it.

Nancy L. Johnson
 Nancy L. Johnson
 Member of Congress

Hamilton Fish, Jr.
 Hamilton Fish, Jr.
 Member of Congress

John R. McKernan, Jr.
 John R. McKernan, Jr.
 Member of Congress